

THE
COMMERCE AND NAVIGATION
OF THE
ERYTHRÆAN SEA;

BEING A TRANSLATION
OF THE
PERIPLUS MARIS ERYTHRÆI,
BY AN ANONYMOUS WRITER,
AND OF
ARRIAN'S ACCOUNT OF THE VOYAGE OF NEARKHOS,
FROM THE MOUTH OF THE INDUS TO THE HEAD OF THE
PERSIAN GULF
WITH INTRODUCTIONS, COMMENTARY, NOTES,
AND INDEX.

BY
J. W. McCRINDLE, M A, EDIN ,

W. PAYNE
DUNDEE
F

(Reprinted, with additions, from the Indian Antiquary)

Calcutta
THACKER, SPINK & Co

Bombay
ED SOC PRESS

London
TRUBNER & Co

1879

BOMBAY :

PRINTED AT THE EDUCATION SOCIETY'S PRESS, BICCLHA.

REFACE

to my former work, "Ancient
d by Megasthenes and Arrian,'
ader that it was my intention
time to time translations of the
i works which relate to ancient
series should be exhausted, and
ume is the second instalment
towards the fulfilment of that undertaking
It contains a translation of the *Periplus* (i e
Circumnavigation) of the *Erythræan Sea*,
together with a translation of the second part
of the *Indica* of Arrian describing the cele-
brated voyage made by Nearchos from the
mouth of the Indus to the head of the Persian
Gulf Arrian's narrative, copied from the
Journal of the voyage written by Nearchos
himself, forms an admirable supplement to the
Periplus, as it contains a minute description of
a part of the Erythræan Coast which is merely
glanced at by the author of that work The
translations have been prepared from the most
approved texts The notes in a few instances
only, bear upon points of textual criticism,
their main object being to present in a concise
form for popular reading the most recent results
of learned enquiry directed to verify, correct,

or otherwise illustrate the contents of the narratives.

The warm and unanimous approbation bestowed upon the first volume of this series, both by the Press in this country and at home, has given me great encouragement to proceed with the undertaking, and a third volume is now in preparation, to contain the *Indika* of Ktésias and the account of India given by Strabo in the 15th Book of his Geography.

Patna College, June 1879.

ANONYMI [ARRIANI UT PERTUR]
PERIPLUS MARIS ERYTHRAEI.

TRANSLATED FROM THE TEXT

As given in the *Geographi Graeci Minores*, edited by
C. Müller Paris, 1828

WITH INTRODUCTION AND COMMENTARY

PERIPLUS OF THE ERYTHRÆAN SEA.

INTRODUCTION.¹

The *Periplus of the Erythræan Sea* is the title prefixed to a work which contains the best account of the commerce carried on from the Red Sea and the coast of Africa to the East Indies during the time that Egypt was a province of the Roman empire. The Erythræan Sea was an appellation given in those days to the whole expanse of ocean reaching from the coast of Africa to the utmost boundary of ancient knowledge on the East—an appellation in all appearance deduced from the entrance into it by the Straits of the Red Sea, styled Erythra by the Greeks, and not excluding the Gulf of Persia.

The author was a Greek merchant, who in the first century of the Christian era had, it would appear, settled at Berenîkê, a great seaport situated in the southern extremity of Egypt, whence he made commercial voyages which carried him to the seaports of Eastern Africa as far as Azania, and to those of Arabia as far as Kænê, whence, by taking advantage of the south west monsoon, he crossed over to the ports lying on the western shores of India. Having made careful

¹ The title is in the original

title, Stuckius attributed the work to Arrian of Nikomedia, and Fabricius to another Arrian who belonged to Alexandria. No one, however, who knows how ancient books are usually treated can fail to see what the real fact here is, viz that since not only the *Periplus Maris Erythraei*, but also the *Anonymi Periplus Ponti Euxini* (whereof the latter part occurs in the Heidelberg MS before Arrian's *Ponti Periplus*) are attributed to Arrian, and the different Arrians are not distinguished by any indications afforded by the titles, there can be no doubt that the well known name of the Nikomedian writer was transferred to the books placed in juxtaposition to his proper works, by the arbitrary judgment of the librarians. In fact it very often happens that short works written by different authors are all referred to one and the same author, especially if they treat of the same subject and are published conjointly in the same volume. But in the case of the work before us, any one would have all the more readily ascribed it to Arrian who had heard by report anything of the *Parapius* of the Erythraean Sea described in that author's *Indika*. On this point there is the utmost unanimity of opinion among writers.

That the author, whatever may have been his name, lived in Egypt, is manifest. Thus he says in § 29 "Several of the trees *with us* in Egypt weep gum," and he joins the names of the Egyptian months with the Roman as may be seen by referring to §§ 6, 33, 42, and 46. The place in which he was settled was probably Berber since it was from that port he embarked on his

Post 8vo, pp. xii.—228, cloth, price 7s. 6d.

THE CLASSICAL POETRY OF THE JAPANESE.

By BASIL HALL CHAMBERLAIN,

Author of "Yeigo Heikaku Shiran."

"A very curious volume. The author has manifestly devoted much labour to the task of studying the poetical literature of the Japanese, and rendering characteristic specimens into English verse."—*Daily News*.

"Mr. Chamberlain's volume is, so far as we are aware, the first attempt which has been made to interpret the literature of the Japanese to the Western world. It is to the classical poetry of Old Japan that we must turn for indigenous Japanese thought, and in the volume before us we have a selection from that poetry rendered into graceful English verse."—*Tablet*.

"It is undoubtedly one of the best translations of lyric literature which has appeared during the close of the last year."—*Celestial Empire*.

"Mr. Chamberlain set himself a difficult task when he undertook to reproduce Japanese poetry in an English form. But he has evidently laboured *con amore*, and his efforts are successful to a degree."—*London and China Express*.

Post 8vo, pp. xii.—164, cloth, price 10s. 6d.

THE HISTORY OF ESARHADDON (Son of Sennacherib), KING OF ASSYRIA. B.C. 681-668.

Translated from the Cuneiform Inscriptions upon Cylinders and Tablets in the British Museum Collection; together with a Grammatical Analysis of each Word, Explanations of the Ideographs by Extracts from the Bi-Lingual Syllabaries, and List of Eponyms, &c.

By ERNEST A. BUDGE, B.A., M.R.A.S.

Assyrian Exhibitioner, Christ's College, Cambridge.

"Students of scriptural archaeology will also appreciate the 'History of Esarhaddon.'"—*Times*.

"There is much to attract the scholar in this volume. It does not pretend to popularise studies which are yet in their infancy. Its primary object is to translate. but it does not assume to be more than tentative, and it offers both to the professed Assyriologist and to the ordinary non-Assyriological Semitic scholar the means of controlling its results."—*Academy*.

"Mr. Budge's book is, of course, mainly addressed to Assyrian scholars and students. They are not, it is to be feared, a very numerous class. But the more thanks are due to him on that account for the way in which he has acquitted himself in his laborious task."—*Tablet*.

Post 8vo, pp. 448, cloth, price 21s.

THE MESNEVI

(Usually known as THE MESNEVIYI SHERIF, or HOLY MESNEVI)

OF

MEVLANA (OUR LORD) JELALU 'D-DIN MUHAMMED ER-RUMI.

Book the First.

*Together with some Account of the Life and Acts of the Author,
of his Ancestors, and of his Descendants.*

Illustrated by a Selection of Characteristic Anecdotes, as Collected
by their Historian,

MEVLANA SHEMSU-'D-DIN AHMED, EL EFLAKI, EL 'ARIFI.

Translated, and the Poetry Versified, in English,

By JAMES W. REDHOUSE, M.R.A.S., &c.

"A complete treasury of occult Oriental lore."—*Saturday Review*.

"This book will be a very valuable help to the reader ignorant of Persia, who is desirous of obtaining an insight into a very important department of the literature extant in that language."—*Tablet*.

Post 8vo, pp. xvi.—280, cloth, price 6s.

EASTERN PROVERBS AND EMBLEMS
ILLUSTRATING OLD TRUTHS.

By REV. J. LONG,

Member of the Bengal Asiatic Society, F.R.G.S.

"We regard the book as valuable, and wish for it a wide circulation and attentive reading."—*Record*.

"Altogether, it is quite a feast of good things."—*Globe*.

"It is full of interesting matter."—*Antiquary*.

Post 8vo, pp. viii.—270, cloth, price 7s. 6d.

INDIAN POETRY;

Containing a New Edition of the "Indian Song of Songs," from the Sanscrit of the "Gita Govinda" of Jayadeva; Two Books from "The Iliad of India" (Mahabharata), "Proverbial Wisdom" from the Shlokas of the Hitopadesa, and other Oriental Poems.

By EDWIN ARNOLD, C.S.I., Author of "The Light of Asia."

"Beautiful Radha, jasmine-bosomed Radha,"

from the allurements of the forest nymphs, in whom the five senses are typified"—*Times*

"No other English poet has ever thrown his genius and his art so thoroughly into the work of translating Eastern ideas as Mr. Arnold has done in his splendid paraphrases of language contained in these mighty epics."—*Daily Telegraph*.

"The poem abounds with imagery of Eastern luxurioseness and sensuousness; the air seems laden with the spicy odours of the tropics, and the verse has a richness and a melody sufficient to captivate the senses of the dullest."—*Standard*.

Post 8vo, pp. xvi.—296, cloth, price 10s. 6d.

THE MIND OF MENCIUS;
OR, POLITICAL ECONOMY FOUNDED UPON MORAL
PHILOSOPHY.

A SYSTEMATIC DIGEST OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE CHINESE PHILOSOPHER
MENCIUS.

Translated from the Original Text and Clarified, with
Comments and Explanations,

By the REV. ERNST FABER, Rhenish Mission Society.

Translated from the German, with Additional Notes,

By the REV. A. B. HUTCHINSON, C.M.S., Church Mission, Hong Kong.

"Mr. Faber is already well known in the field of Chinese studies by his work on the doctrines of Confucius. The value of this work will be evident."

Post 8vo, pp. 336, cloth, price 16s.

THE RELIGIONS OF INDIA.

By A. BARTH.

Translated from the French with the authority and assistance of the Author.

The author has, at the request of the publishers, considerably enlarged the work for the translator, and has added the literature of the subject to date; the translation may, therefore, be looked upon as an equivalent of a new and improved edition of the original.

"Is not only a valuable manual of the religions of India, which marks a distinct step in the treatment of the subject, but also a useful work of reference."—*Academy*.

"This volume is a reproduction, with corrections and additions, of an article contributed by the learned author two years ago to the 'Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses.' It attracted much notice when it first appeared, and is generally admitted to present the best summary extant of the vast subject with which it deals."—*Tablet*.

"This is not only on the whole the best but the only manual of the religions of India, apart from Buddhism, which we have in English. The present work . . . shows not only great knowledge of the facts and power of clear exposition, but also great insight into the inner history and the deeper meaning of the great religion, for it is in reality only one, which it proposes to describe."—*Modern Review*.

"The merit of the work has been emphatically recognised by the most authoritative Orientalists, both in this country and on the continent of Europe. But probably there are few Indianists (if we may use the word) who would not derive a good deal of information from it, and especially from the extensive bibliography provided in the notes."—*Dublin Review*.

"Such a sketch M. Barth has drawn with a master-hand."—*Critic* (New York).

Post 8vo, pp. viii.—152, cloth, price 6s.

HINDU PHILOSOPHY.

THE SĀṆKHYA KĀRIKA OF IS'WARA KRISHNA.

An Exposition of the System of Kapila, with an Appendix on the Nyāya and Vais'eshika Systems.

By JOHN DAVIES, M.A. (Cantab.), M.R.A.S.

The system of Kapila contains nearly all that India has produced in the department of pure philosophy.

"The non-Orientalist . . . finds in Mr. Davies a patient and learned guide who leads him into the intricacies of the philosophy of India, and supplies him with a clue, that he may not be lost in them. In the preface he states that the system of Kapila is the 'earliest attempt on record to give an answer, from reason alone, to the mysterious questions which arise in every thoughtful mind about the origin of the world, the nature and relations of man and his future destiny,' and in his learned and able notes he exhibits 'the connection of the Sankhya system with the philosophy of Spinoza,' and 'the connection of the system of Kapila with that of Schopenhauer and Von Hartmann.'"—*Foreign Church Chronicle*.

"Mr. Davies's volume on Hindu Philosophy is an undoubted gain to all students of the development of thought. The system of Kapila, which is here given in a translation from the Sāṅkhya Kārikā, is the only contribution of India to pure philosophy. . . . Presents many points of deep interest to the student of comparative philosophy, and without Mr. Davies's lucid interpretation it would be difficult to appreciate these points in any adequate manner."—*Saturday Review*.

"We welcome Mr. Davies's book as a valuable addition to our philosophical library."—*Notes and Queries*.

Post 8vo, pp. x.—130, cloth, price 6s.

A MANUAL OF HINDU PANTHEISM. VEDÂNTASÂRA.

Translated, with copious Annotations, by MAJOR G. A. JACOB,
Bombay Staff Corps; Inspector of Army Schools.

The design of this little work is to provide for missionaries, and for others who, like them, have little leisure for original research, an accurate summary of the doctrines of the Vedânta.

.....

Post 8vo, pp. xii.—154, cloth, price 7s. 6d.

TSUNI—| | GOAM :

THE SUPREME BEING OF THE KHOI-KHOI.

By THEOPHILUS HAHN, Ph.D.,

Custodian of the Grey Collection, Cape Town; Corresponding Member
of the Geogr. Society, Dresden; Corresponding Member of the
Anthropological Society, Vienna, &c., &c.

"The first installment of Dr. Hahn's volume will be of interest not only to the
.....

Century

"Dr Hahn's book is that of a man who is both a philologist and believer in
philological methods, and a close student of savage manners and customs"—*Satur-*
day Review

"It is full of good things."—*St James's Gazette*.

In Four Volumes. Vol. I., post 8vo, pp. xii.—392, cloth, price 12s. 6d.

A COMPREHENSIVE COMMENTARY TO THE QURAN.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED SALE'S PRELIMINARY DISCOURSE, WITH
ADDITIONAL NOTES AND EMENDATIONS.

Together with a Complete Index to the Text, Preliminary
Discourse, and Notes.

By Rev. E. M. WHERRY, M.A., Lodiiana.

"As Mr Wherry's book is intended for missionaries in India, it is no doubt well
that they should be prepared to meet, if they can, the ordinary arguments and inter-
pretations, and for this purpose Mr. Wherry's additions will prove useful."—*Saturday*
Review

Post 8vo, pp. vi.—208, cloth, price 8s. 6d.

THE BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀ.

Translated, with Introduction and Notes,

By JOHN DAVIES, M.A. (Cantab.)

"Let us add that his translation of the Bhagavad Gītā is, as we judge, the best that has as yet appeared in English, and that his Philological Notes are of quite peculiar value."—*Dublin Review*.

Post 8vo, pp. 96, cloth, price 5s.

THE QUATRAINS OF OMAR KHAYYAM.

Translated by E. H. WHINFIELD, M.A.,

Barrister-at-Law, late H.M. Bengal Civil Service.

Omar Khayyām (the tent-maker) was born about the middle of the fifth century of the Hejirah, corresponding to the eleventh of the Christian era, in the neighbourhood of Naishapur, the capital of Khorasān, and died in 517 A.H. (=1122 A.D.)

"Mr. Whinfield has executed a difficult task with considerable success, and his version contains much that will be new to those who only know Mr. Fitzgerald's delightful selection."—*Academy*.

"There are several editions of the Quatrains, varying greatly in their readings. Mr. Whinfield has used three of these for his excellent translation. The most prominent features in the Quatrains are their profound agnosticism, combined with a fatalism based more on philosophic than religious grounds, their Epicureanism and the spirit of universal tolerance and charity which animates them."—*Calcutta Review*.

Post 8vo, pp. xxiv.—268, cloth, price 9s.

**THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE UPANISHADS AND
ANCIENT INDIAN METAPHYSICS.**

As exhibited in a series of Articles contributed to the *Calcutta Review*.

By ARCHIBALD EDWARD GOUGH, M.A., Lincoln College, Oxford;
Principal of the Calcutta Madrasa.

"For practical purposes this is perhaps the most important of the works that have thus far appeared in 'Trübner's Oriental Series.' . . . We cannot doubt that for all who may take it up the work must be one of profound interest."—*Saturday Review*.

In Two Volumes. Vol. I., post 8vo, pp. xxiv.—230, cloth, price 7s. 6d.

**A COMPARATIVE HISTORY OF THE EGYPTIAN AND
MESOPOTAMIAN RELIGIONS.**

By DR. C. P. TIELE.

Vol. I.—HISTORY OF THE EGYPTIAN RELIGION.

Translated from the Dutch with the Assistance of the Author.

By JAMES BALLINGAL.

"It places in the hands of the English readers a history of Egyptian Religion which is very complete, which is based on the best materials, and which has been illustrated by the latest results of research. In this volume there is a great deal of information, as well as independent investigation, for the trustworthiness of which Dr. Tiele's name is in itself a guarantee; and the description of the successive religions under the Old Kingdom, the Middle Kingdom, and the New Kingdom, is given in a manner which is scholarly and minute."—*Scotsman*.

Post 8vo, pp. xii—302, cloth, price 8s. 6d.

YUSUF AND ZULAIKHA.

A POEM BY JAMI.

Translated from the Persian into English Verse.

By RALPH T. H. GRIFFITH.

Post 8vo, pp. viii.—266, cloth, price 9s.

LINGUISTIC ESSAYS.

By CARL ABEL.

CONTENTS.

Language as the Expression of National Modes of Thought.	The Connection between Dictionary and Grammar.
The Conception of Love in some Ancient and Modern Languages	The Development of Common Literary Words in the
The English Verbs of Command	Words in the
Semantics	
Philological Methods.	

Mr. Abel writes very good English, and much of his book will prove entertaining to the general reader. It may give some useful hints, and suggest some subjects for profitable investigation, even to philologists. —*Nation (New York)*.

Post 8vo, pp. ix.—281, cloth, price 10s. 6d.

THE SARVA-DARSANA-SAMGRAHA;

OR, REVIEW OF THE DIFFERENT SYSTEMS OF HINDU PHILOSOPHY.

Translated by
of Cam

This work is an interesting specimen of Hindu critical ability. The author successively passes in review the sixteen philosophical systems current in the fourteenth century in the South of India; and he gives what appears to him to be their most important tenets.

"The translation is trustworthy throughout. A protracted sojourn in India, where there is a living tradition, has familiarised the translator with Indian thought." —*Athenæum*

Post 8vo, pp. xxxii.—336, cloth, price 10s. 6d.

THE QUATRAINS OF OMAR KHAYYAM.

The Persian Text, with an English Verse Translation.

By E. H. WHINFIELD, late of the Bengal Civil Service.

Post 8vo, pp. lxx.—368, cloth, price 14s.

TIBETAN TALES DERIVED FROM INDIAN SOURCES.

Translated from the Tibetan of the KAH-GYUR.

By F. ANTON VON SCHIEFNER.

Done into English from the German, with an Introduction,

By W. R. S. RALSTON, M.A.

"The Tibetan Tales have been translated by Mr. Ralston from the German version of Schiefner. Mr. Ralston adds an introduction, which even the most persevering children of Mother Goose will probably find infinitely the most interesting portion of the work."—*Saturday Review*.

"Mr. Ralston, whose name is so familiar to all lovers of Russian folk-lore, has supplied some interesting Western analogies and parallels, drawn, for the most part, from Slavonic sources, to the Eastern folk-tales, culled from the Kahgyur, one of the divisions of the Tibetan sacred books."—*Academy*.

"The translation here presented of F. Anton Schiefner's work could scarcely have fallen into better hands than those of Mr. Ralston. An Introduction of some sixty-four pages gives the leading facts in the lives of those scholars who have given their attention to gaining a knowledge of the Tibetan literature and language, as well as an analysis of the tales."—*Calcutta Review*.

"... Ought to interest all who care for the East, for amusing stories, or for comparative folk-lore. Mr. Ralston ... makes no pretension to being considered an Orientalist; but he is an expert in story-telling, and in knowledge of the comparative history of popular tales he has few rivals in England."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

Post 8vo, pp. xvi.—224, cloth, price 9s.

UDĀNAVARGA.

A COLLECTION OF VERSES FROM THE BUDDHIST CANON.

Compiled by DHARMATRĀTA.

BEING THE NORTHERN BUDDHIST VERSION OF DHAMMAPADA.

Translated from the Tibetan of Bkah-hgyur, with Notes, and
Extracts from the Commentary of Pradjnavarman,

By W. WOODVILLE ROCKHILL.

"Mr. Rockhill's present work is the first from which assistance will be gained for a more accurate understanding of the Pali text; it is, in fact, as yet the only term of comparison available to us. The 'Udanavarga,' the Tibetan version, was originally discovered by the late M. Schiefner, who published the Tibetan text, and had intended adding a translation, an intention frustrated by his death, but which has been carried out by Mr. Rockhill. ... Mr. Rockhill may be congratulated for having well accomplished a difficult task."—*Saturday Review*.

"There is no need to look far into this book to be assured of its value."—*Athenæum*.

"The Tibetan verses in Mr. Woodville Rockhill's translation have all the simple directness and force which belong to the sayings of Gautama, when they have not been adorned and spoiled by enthusiastic disciples and commentators."—*St. James's Gazette*.

Post 8vo, pp. xii.—312, with Maps and Plan, cloth, price 14s.

A HISTORY OF BURMA.

Including Burma Proper, Pegu, Taungu, Tenasserim, and Arakan. From the Earliest Time to the End of the First War with British India.

By LIEUT.-GEN. SIR ARTHUR P. PHAYRE, G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., and C.B.,

Membre Correspondant de la Société Académique Indo-Chinoise de France.

"Sir Arthur Phayre's contribution to Trübner's Oriental Series supplies a recog-

In Two Volumes, post 8vo, pp. xxiv.—566, cloth, accompanied by a Language Map, price 25s.

A SKETCH OF THE MODERN LANGUAGES OF AFRICA.

By ROBERT NEEDHAM CUST,

Barrister-at-Law, and late of Her Majesty's Indian Civil Service.

Post 8vo, pp. 276, cloth, price 7s. 6d.

RELIGION IN CHINA.

By JOSEPH EDKINS, D.D., PEKING.

Containing a Brief Account of the Three Religions of the Chinese, with Observations on the Prospects of Christian Conversion amongst that People.

"Dr. Edkins has been most careful in noting the varied and often complex phases of opinion, so as to give an account of considerable value of the subject."—*Scotsman*

"Dr. Edkins . . . may now be fairly regarded as among the first authorities on Chinese religion and language."—*British Quarterly Review*.

Second Edition. Post 8vo, pp. xv.—250, cloth, price 7s. 6d.

OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF RELIGION TO THE SPREAD OF THE UNIVERSAL RELIGIONS.

By C. P. TIELE.

Doctor of Theology, Professor of the History of Religions in the University of Leyden.

Translated from the Dutch by J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, M.A.

THE FOLLOWING WORKS ARE IN PREPARATION:—

Post 8vo.

UPASAKADASÂSÛTRA.

A Jain Story Book.

Translated from the Sanskrit.

By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE.

In Two Volumes, post 8vo, cloth.

**BUDDHIST RECORDS OF THE WESTERN WORLD,
BEING THE SI-YU-KI BY HWEN THSANG.**

Translated from the Original Chinese, with Introduction, Index, &c.,
By SAMUEL BEAL,

Trinity College, Cambridge; Professor of Chinese, University
College, London.

Post 8vo.

**THE APHORISMS OF THE SANKHYA PHILOSOPHY
OF KAPILA.**

With Illustrative Extracts from the Commentaries.

By the late J. R. BALLANTYNE.

Second Edition. Edited by FITZEDWARD HALL.

Post 8vo.

**THE LIFE OF THE BUDDHA AND THE EARLY
HISTORY OF HIS ORDER.**

Derived from Tibetan Works.

By W. W. ROCKHILL.

Post 8vo.

INDIAN IDYLLS.

FROM THE SANSKRIT OF THE MAHÂBHÂRATA.

By EDWIN ARNOLD, C.S.I.,

Author of "The Light of Asia," &c.

Post 8vo.

BURMESE PROVERBS AND MAXIMS.

By JAMES GRAY,

Of the Government High School, Rangoon.

Post 8vo.

**MÂNAVA-DHARMA-CÂSTRA ;
OR, LAWS OF MANU.**

A New Translation, with Introduction, Notes, &c.

By A. C. BURNELL, Ph.D., C.I.E.,

A Foreign Member of the Royal Danish Academy, and Hon. Member
of several Learned Societies.

LONDON: TRÜBNER & CO., 57 AND 59 LUDGATE HILL.

Messrs. Trübner & Co. have received the following opinions on Professor Albrecht Weber's "History of Indian Literature:"—

Dr. BUHLER, Inspector of Schools in India, writes :—

"I am extremely glad to learn that you are about to publish an English translation of Professor A. Weber's 'History of Indian Literature.' When I was Professor of Oriental Languages in Elphinstone College, I frequently felt the want of such a work to which I could refer the students. I trust that the work which you are now publishing will become a class-book in all the Indian Colleges, as it is the first and only scientific one which deals with the whole field of Vedic, Sanskrit, and Prakrit literature."

Professor COWELL, of Cambridge, writes :—

"The English translation of Professor A. Weber's 'History of Indian Literature' will be of the greatest use to those who wish to take a comprehensive survey of all that the Hindu mind has achieved. It will be especially useful to the students in our Indian Colleges and Universities. I used to long for such a book when I was teaching in Calcutta. Hindu students are intensely interested in the history of Sanskrit literature, and this volume will supply them with all they want on the subject. I hope it will be made a text-book wherever Sanskrit and English are taught."

J. EGGLING, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in the University of Edinburgh, writes :—

"I am delighted to hear that the English translation of Professor Weber's 'Lectures on Hindu Literature' is at last ready for publication. The great want of a general critical survey of Sanskrit literature in English, such as Professor Weber gave to German students more than a quarter of a century ago, must have been felt by all scholars engaged in teaching Sanskrit in

British and American Universities. The translation, I have no doubt, will be welcomed even more cordially by Hindu students, to whom, with few exceptions, Professor Weber's Lectures must hitherto have been a sealed book. Hindu scholars and students have expressed to me repeatedly how much they feel the want of English translations of German works such as Weber's Lectures and Lassen's 'Indian Antiquities,' an acquaintance with which is indeed indispensable in dealing with questions of Sanskrit Literature. From what I have seen in proof of the English edition, I may say that the translation seemed to me exceedingly well done, and that it does great credit to the gentlemen engaged on it."

Dr. R. ROST, Librarian of the India Office, writes :—

"I have carefully examined and compared with the original German the English translation of pp. 1-24 of Weber's 'Vorlesungen,' and am able to state that it is more than a mere faithful reflex of the original work, and that it has the advantage of a very readable style and great clearness of expression. If the remainder of the translation is executed as carefully and as conscientiously as is the portion I have read, the whole will reflect the greatest credit upon the scholars who have been engaged upon it."

Professor WHITNEY, Yale College, Newhaven, Conn., U.S.A., writes :—

"I am the more interested in your enterprise of the publication of Weber's 'Sanskrit Literature' in an English version, as I was one of the class to whom the work was originally given in the form of academic lectures. At their first appearance they were by far the most learned and able treatment of their subject; and, with their recent additions, they still maintain decidedly the same rank. Wherever the language, and institutions, and history of India are studied, they must be used and referred to as authority."

TRÜBNER'S
ORIENTAL SERIES.



III.

Ballantyne Press
BALLANTYNE, HANSON AND CO.
EDINBURGH AND LONDON

THE HISTORY
OF
INDIAN LITERATURE.

BY
ALBRECHT WEBER.

Translated from the Second German Edition

BY
JOHN MANN, M.A.,
AND
THEODOR ZACHARIAE, PH.D.,

With the Sanction of the Author.

*Nil desperari—
Auch hier wird es liegen.*

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:
TRÜBNER & CO., LUDGATE HILL.
1882.

[All rights reserved.]

TRANSLATORS' NOTE.

original intention, the English translation was to have appeared shortly after the original, which came out in the end of 1875, and was intended by the author in his preface, was in accordance with a view to this translation. In consequence of the death of Professor Childers, and as it was in the first instance begun, and under his supervision it would, had he lived, have had the benefit, the work came to a stand-still, and some time elapsed before the task of continuing and completing it was entrusted to those whose names appear on the title-page. The manuscript of the translation thus interrupted embraced a considerable part of the text of the first division of the work (Vedic Literature). It had not undergone any revision by Professor Childers, and was found to be in a somewhat imperfect state, and to require very material modification. Upon Mr. Zachariae devolved the labour of correcting it, of completing it as far as the close of the Vedic Period, and of adding the notes to this First Part, none of which had been translated. From the number of changes introduced in the course of revision, the portion of the work comprised in the manuscript in question has virtually been re-translated. The rendering of the second division of the volume (Sanskrit Literature) is entirely and exclusively the work of Mr. Mann.

The circumstances under which the translation has been

produced have greatly delayed its appearance. But for this delay some compensation is afforded by the Supplementary Notes which Professor Weber has written for incorporation in the volume (p. 311 ff.), and which supply information regarding the latest researches and the newest publications bearing upon the subjects discussed in the work. Professor Weber has also been good enough to read the sheets as they came from the press, and the translators are indebted to him for a number of suggestions.

A few of the abbreviations made use of in the titles of works which are frequently quoted perhaps require explanation: *e.g.*, *I. St.* for Weber's *Indische Studien*; *I. Str.* for his *Indische Streifen*; *I. AK.* for Lassen's *Indische Alterthumskunde*; *Z. D. M. G.* for *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, &c.

The system of transliteration is in the main identical with that followed in the German original; as, however, it varies in a few particulars, it is given here instead of in the Author's Preface. It is as follows:—

a	á	i	í	u	ú	ri	rí
li	lí	e	ai	o	au;		
k	kh	g	gh	ñ;			
ch	chh	j	jh	ñ;			
t	th	d	dh	n;			
ṭ	ṭh	ḍ	ḍh	n;			
p	ph	b	bh	m;			
y	r	l	v;				
ś	sh	s	h;				

Anusvára ṁ, in the middle of a word before sibilants ś ṣ;
Visarga ḥ.

July, 1878.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE work of my youth, which here appears in a new edition, had been several years out of print. To have republished it without alteration would scarcely have done ; and, owing to the pressure of other labours, it was impossible for me, from lack of time, to subject it to a complete and systematic remodelling. So the matter rested. At last, to meet the urgent wish of the publisher, I resolved upon the present edition, which indeed leaves the original text unchanged, but at the same time seeks, by means of the newly added notes, to accommodate itself to the actual position of knowledge. In thus finally deciding, I was influenced by the belief that in no other way could the great advances made in this field of learning since the first appearance of this work be more clearly exhibited than precisely in this way, and that, consequently, this edition might at the same time serve in some measure to present, *in nuce*, a history of Sanskrit studies during the last four-and-twenty years. Another consideration was, that only by so doing could I furnish a critically secured basis for the English translation contemplated by Messrs. Trubner & Co., which could not possibly now give the original text alone, as was done in the French transla-

produced have greatly delayed its appearance. But for this delay some compensation is afforded by the Supplementary Notes which Professor Weber has written for incorporation in the volume (p. 311 ff.), and which supply information regarding the latest researches and the newest publications bearing upon the subjects discussed in the work. Professor Weber has also been good enough to read the sheets as they came from the press, and the translators are indebted to him for a number of suggestions.

A few of the abbreviations made use of in the titles of works which are frequently quoted perhaps require explanation: *e.g.*, *I. St.* for Weber's *Indische Studien*; *I. Str.* for his *Indische Streifen*; *I. AK.* for Lassen's *Indische Alterthumskunde*; *Z. D. M. G.* for *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, &c.

The system of transliteration is in the main identical with that followed in the German original; as, however, it varies in a few particulars, it is given here instead of in the Author's Preface. It is as follows:—

a	á	i	í	u	ú	ṛi	ṛí
li	lī	e	ai	o	au;		
k	kh	g	gh	ñ;			
ch	chh	j	jh	ñ;			
ṭ	ṭh	ḍ	ḍh	ṇ;			
t	th	d	dh	n;			
p	ph	b	bh	m;			
y	r	l	v;				
ś	sh	s	h;				

Anusvāra ṁ, in the middle of a word before sibilants ṣ ṇ;

Visarga ḥ.

July, 1878.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.



THE work of my youth, which here appears in a new edition, has been several years out of print. To have republished it without alteration would scarcely have done, and, owing to the pressure of other labours, it was impossible for me, from lack of time, to subject it to a complete and systematic remodelling. So the matter rested. At last, to meet the urgent wish of the publisher, I resolved upon the present edition, which indeed leaves the original text unchanged, but at the same time seeks, by means of the newly added notes, to accommodate itself to the actual position of knowledge. In thus finally deciding, I was influenced by the belief that in no other way could the great advances made in this field of learning since the first appearance of this work be more clearly exhibited than precisely in this way, and that, consequently, this edition might at the same time serve in some measure to present, in *nuce*, a history of Sanskrit studies during the last four-and-twenty years. Another consideration was, that only by so doing could I furnish a critically secured basis for the English translation contemplated by Messrs. Trübner & Co., which could not possibly now give the original text alone, as was done in the French transla-

tion,* which appeared at Paris in 1859. It was, indeed, while going over the work with the view of preparing it for this English translation, that the hope, nay, the conviction, grew upon me, that, although a complete reconstruction of it was out of the question, still an edition like the present might advantageously appear in a German dress also. I rejoiced to see that this labour of my youth was standing well the test of time. I found in it little that was absolutely erroneous, although much even now remains as uncertain and unsettled as formerly; while, on the other hand, many things already stand clear and sure which I then only doubtfully conjectured, or which were at that time still completely enveloped in obscurity.

The obtaining of critical data from the contents of Indian literature, with a view to the establishment of its internal chronology and history—not the setting forth in detail of the subject-matter of the different works—was, from the beginning, the object I had before me in these lectures; and this object, together with that of specifying the publications which have seen the light in the interval, has continued to be my leading point of view in the present annotation of them. To mark off the new matter, square brackets are used.†

The number of fellow-workers has greatly increased during the last twenty-four years. Instead of here running over their names, I have preferred—in order thus to faci-

* *Histoire de la Littérature Indienne, trad. de l'Allemand par Alfred Sadous.* Paris: A. Durand. 1859.

† In the translation, these brackets are only retained to mark new matter added in the second edition to the original notes of the first; the notes which in the second edition were entirely new are here simply indicated by numbers.—TR.

litate a general view of this part of the subject—to add to the Index, which in other respects also has been considerably enlarged, a new section, showing where I have availed myself of the writings of each, or have at least referred to them. One work there is, however, which, as it underlies all recent labours in this field, and cannot possibly be cited on every occasion when it is made use of, calls for special mention in this place—I mean the Sanskrit Dictionary of Böhtlingk and Roth, which was completed in the course of last summer.* The carrying through of this great work, which we owe to the patronage of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, over a period of a quarter of a century, will reflect lasting honour upon that body as well as upon the two editors.

A. W.

BERLIN, November, 1875.

* The second edition bears the inscription : 'Dedicated to my friends, Böhtlingk and Roth, on the completion of the Sanskrit Dictionary.'—TR.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THE lectures herewith presented to the narrow circle of my fellows in this field of study, and also, it is hoped, to the wider circle of those interested in researches into the history of literature generally, are a first attempt, and as such, naturally, defective and capable of being in many respects supplemented and improved. The material they deal with is too vast, and the means of mastering it in general too inaccessible, not to have for a lengthened period completely checked inquiry into its *internal relative* chronology—the only chronology that is possible. Nor could I ever have ventured upon such a labour, had not the Berlin Royal Library had the good fortune to possess the fine collection of Sanskrit MSS. formed by Sir R. Chambers, the acquisition of which some ten years ago, through the liberality of his Majesty, Frederick William IV., and by the agency of his Excellency Baron Bunsen, opened up to Sanskrit philology a fresh path, upon which it has already made vigorous progress. In the course of last year, commissioned by the Royal Library, I undertook the work of cataloguing this collection, and as the result a detailed catalogue will appear about simultaneously with these lectures, which may in some sense be regarded as a

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THE LATTER PART OF THIS VOLUME IS THE LATTER PART OF
my fellow-student's work, and also it is devoted to
the wider circle of those interested in researches into the
history of literature generally, and a first attempt and a
such, naturally, defective and capable of being in many
respects supplemented and improved. The material they
deal with is too vast, and the means of mastering it in
general too inaccessible, not to have for a lengthened
period a completely checked inquiry into its *internal relations*
chronological—the only chronology that is possible. Nor
could I ever have ventured upon such a labour, had not
the *British Library* had the good fortune to possess
the *large collection of Sanskrit MSS.* formed by the
Emperor of the Marathas of which some ten years ago
through the liberality of His Majesty, *Frederick William*
III. was the property of His Excellency *Baron von*
Heineken, who has since a fresh gift of some 100
MS. has been made to the *British Library*. It is a great
treasure of the *British Library* and it is a great
honour to the *British Library* to have it in its possession.
Baron von Heineken has been a great benefactor to the
British Library and it is a great honour to the
British Library to have it in its possession.

commentary upon it. Imperfect as, from the absolute point of view, both works must appear, I yet cherish the hope that they may render good service to learning.

How great my obligations are, in the special investigations, to the writings of Colebrooke, Wilson, Lassen, Bur-nouf, Roth, Reinaud, Stenzler, and Holtzmann, I only mention here generally, as I have uniformly given ample references to these authorities in the proper place.

The form in which these lectures appear is essentially the same in which they were delivered,* with the exception of a few modifications of style: thus, in particular, the transitions and recapitulations belonging to oral delivery have been either curtailed or omitted; while, on the other hand, to the incidental remarks—here given as foot-notes—much new matter has been added.

A. W.

BERLIN, *July*, 1852.

* In the Winter-Semester of 1851-52.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION,	1-7
Antiquity of Indian literature, 2; proved by geographical evidence, 3-4; by internal evidence from the history of the Hindú religion, 5; by evidence drawn from the language, 6; want of external chronology, 7.	
<i>FIRST PERIOD—VEDIC LITERATURE.</i>	
PRELIMINARY SURVEY,	8-30
(1.) <i>The Samhitás</i> , 8-11.	
Samhitás of the three older Vedas, 8-9; mutual relation of these three Vedas, 9-10; period of their final compilation, 10; Samhitá of the Atharvan, 11.	
(2.) <i>The Bráhmaṇas</i> , 11-15.	
Their character, 12, and origin, 13; mutual relation of the Bráhmaṇas of the several Vedas, 14; their common name Śruti, 15.	
(3.) <i>The Sūtras</i> , &c.	
Their character and origin, 16; Śrauta-Sūtras, 17; Grihya- or Smárta-Sūtras, 17; gradual transformation of the original Smṛiti (Custom and Law), 17, 18; origin of caste, 18; connection between the Grihya-Sūtras and the legal literature, 19-20; linguistic Sūtras, their origin, 20, 21; character of the time in question, 21, 22; Prátiśákhya-Sūtras, 23; metric, 23, Anukramanías, 24; tradition—Bṛihaddevatá, 24; Nighaṇṭu, Nirukti, the Vedāṅgas, 25; science of grammar, 26; philosophical speculation, 26 ff.; names applied to the early ages, 28; Upanishads, Áraṇyakas, 28, 29; astronomy and medicine, 29, 30.	
4.—RIGVEDA,	31-62
(a) <i>Samhitá</i> , 31-44	
Its divisions, 31, 32; Śákhá and Váshkhá recensions.	

32; Várkali, the school of the Śunakas, 33; Śaunaka, Pañchāla Bābhravya, 34; mythology of the primitive Indo-Germanic time, 35; Persian and Indian cycles of legend, 36, 37; mode of life of the Indians in their ancient home, 37, 38; reasons why they left their ancient homes, 38, 39; different constituents of R̥gveda-Saṃhitā, 39; gods to whom the hymns are addressed, 40; exegetic literature connected with the Saṃhitā: Yāska, 41; Sāyaṇa, 41, 42; editions, translations, &c., 43, 44.

(b) *Brāhmaṇas*, 44-52.

Aitareya- and Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇas, 44; data therein bearing on time of their composition, 45; they presuppose earlier compositions with similar contents, 45-47; fables and legends contained in these two Brāhmaṇas, 47; the Āraṇyakas of the R̥ik: Aitareya-Āraṇyaka, 48 ff.; Kaushītakāraṇyaka, Kaushītakopanishad, 50, 51; Śaṃkara's commentaries on the Upanishads, 51; Vāshkāla-Upanishad, 52.

(c) *Sūtras*, 52, 62.

The Śrauta-Sūtras of Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana, 52 ff.; commentaries thereon, 54, 55; the Gṛihya-Sūtras of Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana, 55 ff.; the literature presupposed in these, 56, 57; R̥ik-Prātisākhya, Upalekha, 59, 60; Śikshā, Chhandas, Jyotisha, 60, 61; Anukramaṇis, 61; Bṛihaddevatā, R̥igvidhāna, Pariśishtas, 62.

B—SĀMAVEDA, 63-85.

(a) *Saṃhitā*, 63-66.

Its arrangement, 63; the Gānas, 64; antiquity of the readings of the Sāma-Saṃhitā, 64, 65; recensions, 65; editions, &c., 65, 66.

(b) *Brāhmaṇas*, 66-75.

The Tāṇḍya-Pañchaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, 66 ff.; geographical and other data contained therein, 67-68; Shadviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, 69; Chhāndogyopanishad, its relation to the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka, 70, 71; literary and other data in the Chhāndogyop., 71, 72; Kenopanishad, 73; the smaller Brāhmaṇas of the Sāmāna—Sāmavidhāna, &c., 74, 75.

(c) *Sūtras*, 75-85.

Śrauta-Sūtras: the Kalpa-Sūtra of Maśaka, 75-76; Lāṭyāyana-Sūtra, 76 ff.; literature therein presupposed, 76, 77; position of non-Brahmanical tribes in this work, 77; existence of Buddhism presupposed, 78; Sūtra of Drāhyāyana, 79; its relation to the Sūtras of the other

Vedas, 80; Anupada-Sûtra, 80, 81; Nidána-Sûtra, 81, 82; the Pushpa-Sûtra of Gobhila, 82; Sáma-Tantra, Pañchavidhi-, Pratihára-, Tandílakshana-, and Upa-grantha-Sûtras, 83; the Grihya-Sûtra of Gobhila, 84; the Karma-pradîpa of Kátyáyana, 84; Paddhatis and Paríśiṣṭas, 85.

C.—YAJURVEDA, 85-145

I.—THE BLACK YAJUS, 85-103

(a) *Samhitás*, 85-91.

Difference between the Black and the White Yajus, 86; names of the Black Yajus, 86 ff.; Charaka, Taittiríya, and Khándikíya, 87, 88; schools of the Black Yajus: Taittiríya-Samhitá (Ápastamba), the Káthaka, and the Átreya Śákhá, 88; Samhitás of the Ápastamba and Átreya schools, and the Káthaka, 89; data contained therein, 90; Yáska's connection with the arrangement of the Samhitá of the Black Yajus, 91; the Mánava and the Maitra, 91.

(b) *Bráhmaṇas*, 92-99.

The Bráhmaṇas of the Ápastamba and Átreya schools; the Káthaka portion of the Taitt. Bráhmaṇa, 92; Taittiríya-Áraṇyaka, 93; Upanishads of the Taitt. Ár., 93, 94, schools of the Bháḥlavins, Sátyáyanins, Śákyáyanins, &c., 95; Śvetáśvataropaniṣad, 96; Maitráyaṇa-Upaniṣad, its modern date, 97; the planets, &c., in the Maitr. Up., 98; possible relation of the work to Buddha, 99.

(c) *Sûtras*, 99-103.

Śrauta-Sûtras, 99-101; Grihya-Sûtras, 101, 102; Práti-śákhya-Sûtra, 102; Anukramaṇís, 103.

II —THE WHITE YAJUS, 103-145

The name explained, 103 f.; the name 'Vájasaneyi,' 104 f.; the two schools of the Káṇvas and Mádhyaṃdinas, 105; possible connection of the Mádhyaṃdinas with the Mañavádal, 106.

(a) *Samhitá*, 107-116.

Division of the Vájasaneyi-Samhitá, 107; later origin of the last fifteen *adhýayas*, 108; relation of the several parts of the Váj. S. to the Black Yajus, 108; to its own Bráhmaṇa, and to each other, 109-110; probable date of the Rudra-book, 110; the mixed castes, 111; position of the Mágadha, 111; his position in the Atharva-Veda, 112; astronomical and other data in the Váj. S., 113; position of the Kurus and Pañchálas, the names Subhadrá and Kámpíla, 114; Arjuna and

Phalgunā as (secret) names of Indra, 115; the *richas* incorporated in the Yajus, 115, 116; editions, commentaries, 116.

(b) *Brāhmaṇa*, 116-139.

The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, 116; its name and extent, 117; relation of the Brāhmaṇa of the Kāṇva school to that of the Mādhyandina, 117, 118; relation of the several *kāṇḍas* to the Samhitā and to each other, 118, 119; posteriority of the last five *kāṇḍas*, 120; Aguirahasya-kāṇḍa, 120, 121; Aṣṭādhyāyī-kāṇḍa, 121; subjects of study named therein, 121, 122; other data, 122, 123; Aśvamedha-kāṇḍa, 124 ff.; Gāthās, 124, 125; position of Janamejaya, 125; of the Pārikshittiyas, 126; the Āraṇyaka-kāṇḍa, 126; the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka:—Madhu-kāṇḍa, 127; its name and list of teachers, 128; Yājñavalkya-kāṇḍa, 129; Khila-kāṇḍa, 130; the concluding *raśa* of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, 131; probable north-western origin of *kāṇḍas* vi.-x. of the Śatap. Br., 132; the whole blended together by one arranging hand, 133; teachers mentioned in the Śatap. Br., 133, 134; legends, 134 ff.; relation of these to the Epic legends, 135; position of the Kuru-Pāṇḍulas compared with that of the Pārikshitas, 136; the Pāṇḍavas not mentioned, 137; points of contact with the Sāṃkhya tradition, 137; with Buddhist legend, 138; commentaries on the Śatap. Br., editions, &c., 139.

(c) *Sūtras*, 139-145.

The Śrauta-Sūtra of Kātyāyana, teachers mentioned therein, 139; other data, 140; commentaries, 141; Pad-dhatis and Paśiśiṣṭas: Nigama-Paśiśiṣṭa, Pravara-dhyāya, Charaṇa-vyūha; the Vaijavāpa-Sūtra, 142; the Kāṭiya-Grihya-Sūtra of Pāraskara, 142, 143; the Prāti-śākhya-Sūtra of the Vājasaneyi-Samh., 143, 144; Anukramanī, 144, 145.

D.—ATHARVAVEDA, 145-171

(a) *Samhitā*, 145-150.

Extent and division of Atharvaveda-Samhitā, 145, 146; its contents and arrangement, 146; it probably originated in part with the unbrāhmanised Aryans of the West, 147; data furnished by the Ath. S., the name 'Atharvan,' 148; earliest mention of this name, 149; the name 'Brahmaveda,' its meaning, 149, 150; editions, &c., of the Ath. S., 150.

II. Vedānta.

The Bṛhadāraṇyaka, 150-151.

3. Śāstra Upaniṣad.

The Aṣṭaṅga, Upaniṣad, 151; Anukramanī, 152; the Taittīrya-Sūtra, 153; Kalpas and Parīśiṣṭas, 153.

Upaniṣads, 154-171.

*Number of the Upaniṣads, 154, 155; Upaniṣads belonging to the three older Vedas, 155, 156; special division of the Upaniṣads into three groups: Vedānta, Yoga, and Śaṅkarian Upaniṣads, 156; Atharvan remnants of Upaniṣads borrowed from the other Vedas, 157. THE ŚĀSTRĀVYĀNĪSHĀDAS PROPER: (1.) those of the Vedānta class—the Mundakopaniṣad, 158, 159; Prasnopaniṣad, 159, 160; Garbhopaniṣad, 160; Brahmapaniṣad, 160, 161; Māṇḍūkīyopaniṣad, 161; remaining Upaniṣads of the Vedānta class: Prāgnānihotrop, Ārṣhiṇī, 161, 162; (2.) *Ātharvopaniṣads of the Yoga class*: Śāṅkara, Bhāskara, Ārupaka, Bhāṭṭari, and others, 163; range of ideas and style in this class of Upaniṣads, 165; (3.) *the Śaṅkarian Upaniṣads*, 165 ff.; (a) those in which worship of Viṣṇu (under the names Nārāyaṇa, &c.) is indicated, 166; Nṛsiṅhāṇiṣad, 167; Rāmāṇiṣad, 168; Govindāṇiṣad, 169; (2) Upaniṣads of the Śiva sects: Śatarudriya, Kaivalyopaniṣad, 169; Atharvaśira, 169, 170; remaining Upaniṣads of the Śiva sects, 170, 171.*

SECOND PERIOD—SANSKRIT LITERATURE.

WHEREIN DISTINGUISHED FROM FIRST PERIOD, . . . 175-183

*Distinction in respect of language, 175; gradual development of Indo-Aryan *Bhāṣā*, 176; influence of Indian aborigines thereon, 177; separation of written language from popular dialects—ancient dialectic differences, 178; rock-inscriptions in popular dialects, 179; internal evidence for posteriority of second period, 180; critical condition of texts in this period—age of MSS., 181; distinction as regards subject-matter, 182; classification of Sanskrit literature, 183.*

A.—WORKS OF POETRY, . . . 183-215

1. EPIC POETRY, 183-196.

(a) *Itihāsa*, 183-189: forerunners of Epic poetry in Vedic

period, 183; the Mahā-Bhārata, 184; existence of a work resembling it in first century A.D., 186; legend of Mahā-Bhārata, its relation to Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, &c., 186; text of Mahā-Bhārata, non-epic constituents, 187; Kāvī translation; Jaimini-Bhārata, 189; (b) *Purāṇas*: their general character—ancient *Purāṇas* lost—absence of epic and prominence of ritual element in existing *Purāṇas* and *Upa-purāṇas*, 190, 191; (c) *Kāvya*s, 191–196: the *Rāmāyaṇa*, 191; its allegorical character, 192; colonisation of Southern India, 193; *Rāmāyaṇa* the work of a single author, 193; different recensions of the text, 194; remaining *Kāvya*s, artificial Epic, 195.

2. DRAMATIC POETRY, 196–208.

Origin of Drama from dancing, 196; *Nāṭa-Sūtras* mentioned in Pāṇini, 197; dancing at the great sacrificial festivals, 198; alleged mention of dramas in oldest (?) Buddhist writings, 199; age of surviving dramas, 200; no foundation for the view which places Kālidāsa in the first century B.C., 201, 202; internal evidence from Kālidāsa's dramas themselves on this point, 203; authenticity of the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, 204; age of Śūdraka's *Mṛcchhakatī*, 205; subject-matter and special peculiarities of the Hindū drama, 206; possibility of Greek influence on its development, 207.

3. LYRICAL POETRY, 208–210.

Religious lyric, 208; Erotic lyric: *Megha-dūta*, &c., 209; mystical character of some of these poems—the *Gītagovinda*, 210.

4. ETHICO-DIDACTIC POETRY, 210–213.

Nīti-śāstras, 210; 'Beast-Fable,' 211; *Pāñcha-tantra*, *Hito-padeśa*, 212; popular tales and romances, 213.

5. HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY, 213–215.

Rāja-taraṅgiṇī, 213; inscriptions, grants, and coins, 215.

B.—WORKS OF SCIENCE AND ART, 215–276

1. SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE, 216–232.

(a) *Grammar*, 216–225: Pāṇini's *Grammar*, its peculiar terminology, 216; Pāṇini's date—statements of the Chinese traveller Hiuan T'sang, 217; weakness of the evidence on which Böhtlingk's view rests, 218; existence of *Mahābhāṣya* in the time of Abhimanyu, 219; acquaintance with Greeks presupposed in Pāṇini, 220; 'Yavanāni,' 221; commentaries on Pāṇini—*Paribhāṣhās*,

Várttikas, Mahābhāṣya, 222; date of Kātyāyana, 222; of the Mahābhāṣya, 223; critical condition of the text of Pāṇini, 224; Gana-pātha, &c., 225; other grammatical systems, 226. (b) *Lexicography*, 227-230: Amara-koṣha, no foundation for the view which places it in the first century B.C., 228; internal evidence against this view, 229; age of the work still uncertain, 230; Dhātu-pāthas, 230. (c) *Metric, Poetics, Rhetoric*, 231, 232: Chhandah-Śāstra of Piṅgala, Alamkāra-Śāstra of Bharata, Sāhitya-darpaṇa, 231.

2. PHILOSOPHY, 232-246.

High antiquity of philosophical speculation among the Hindūs, 232; 'Development,' 'Arrangement,' 'Creation' theories of the world, 233; gradual growth of these theories into philosophical systems, 234; the Sāṃkhya-system, 235, 236; the Yoga-system, 237; Deistic sects, 238; influence of Sāṃkhya-Yoga on development of Gnosticism and Śūfism, 239; the two Mīmāṃsā, 239; Karma-Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra of Jaimini, 240; Brahma-Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra of Bādarāyaṇa, 242, age of Bādarāyaṇa, 243; the two logical systems, Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, 244; Heterodox systems, 246.

3. ASTRONOMY AND AUXILIARY SCIENCES, 246-264

Antiquity of astronomy, 246; solar year, quinquennial cycle, Yugas, 247; the lunar asterisms, 247; mention of these in Rik-Saṃhitā, 248; Jyotiṣa, 249; the planets, 249; their peculiar Indian names and number, 250; importance of Greek influence here, 251; relations of Greeks with India, 251; the Yavanas, teachers of the ancient Indian astronomers, 252; 'Ptolemaios,' 'Asura-Maya,' 253; Romaka-Siddhānta, Paulīśa-Siddhānta, 253; Greek terms in Varāha-Mihira, 254, 255; further development of Indian astronomy: Hindūs the teachers of the Arabs, 255 (also in algebra and arithmetic,—the arithmetical figures, 256), and through the Arabs, of European mediæval astronomers, 257; Āryabhata, 257; the five Siddhāntas, 258; Brahmagupta, Varāha-Mihira, 259; date of Varāha-Mihira, Śatānanda, and Bhāskara, 260, 261; Albīrūnī's statements regarding Bhāskara (?), 262. Later period: Arabs in turn the teachers of the Hindūs in astrology, 263; Arabic technical terms in Indian and European astrological works, 263, 264; lore of omens and portents, 264; magic, &c., 264.

4. MEDICAL SCIENCE, 265-271.

Its earliest representatives, 265; Charaka, Suśruta, Dhanvantari, 266; Śālihotra, Vātsyāyana, 267; uncertain date of extant medical works, 268; Hindú medicine apparently an independent development, 269; questionable authenticity of existing texts, 269; importance of Indian medicine, 269; its influence on Arabs, 270.

5. ART OF WAR, MUSIC, FORMATIVE AND TECHNICAL ARTS, 271-276.

Art of war (Dhanur-veda): Viśvámitra, Bharadvāja, 271; music (Gāndharva-veda), 271 (musical notation, 272); Artha-Śāstra, 273; painting and sculpture, 273; architecture, 274; technical arts, 275.

C.—WORKS ON LAW, CUSTOM, AND RELIGIOUS WORSHIP, 276-283

The Dharma-Śāstras, 276; Code of Manu, Brahmanical organisation as here presented, 276; highly developed judicial procedure here exhibited, 277; connection of Dharma-Śāstras with Grihya-Sūtras, 277, 278; critical questions connected with existing text of Manu, 279; different redactions of Manu and the other Dharma-Śāstras, number of these, 280; relation of Manu's Code to that of Yājñavalkya, date of the latter, 280, 281; Epic poetry and Purāṇas also sources for Hindú law, 282; modern jurisprudence, 282; Dekhan the chief seat of literary activity after eleventh century, 283.

D.—BUDDHISTIC SANSKRIT LITERATURE, 283-310

Buddhism, its origin from Sāṃkhya doctrine, 284; relation of Buddhist legend to the later portions of Vedic literature, 285; princes of same name in Buddhist legend and Śatapatha-Brahmaṇa, 286; position in former of Kuru-Pañchālas, Pāṇḍavas, Māgadhas, 286, 287; Buddhist eras, 287; discordance of these with other historical evidence, 287; earliest demonstrable use of these eras, 288; Buddha's doctrine, 288; his novel way of promulgating it, and opposition to Brahmanical hierarchy, 289; tradition as to redaction of Buddhist sacred scriptures, Northern and Southern, 290; mutual relation of the two collections, 292; Pāli historical literature, 293; scriptures of Northern Buddhists, their gradual origin, 294; language in which Southern scriptures were at first preserved different from that in which the Northern scriptures were recorded at third

council, 295, 296 (Jaina-literature, 296) ; data furnished by Buddhistic Sanskrit literature of doubtful authority for Buddha's age, 297.

- (a) The *Sūtra-Piṭaka*: distinction between the *simple* and the *Mahāvaiṣṭya-Sūtras*, 298 ; poetical pieces in latter, Gāthā-dialect, 299 ; contents of the *simple Sūtras*: Ityukta, Vyākaraṇa, Avadāna, Adbhuta-dharma, Geya, Gāthā, Upadeśa, Nidāna, Jātaka, 300, 301 ; their Pantheon different from that of the Brāhmaṇa-texts, 301 ; but identical with that of the Epic poetry, 303 ; other chronological data in the Sūtras, 304.—(b) The *Vinaya-Piṭaka*: discipline of clergy, system of mendicancy, 305 ; Buddhistic hierarchy as distinguished from the Brahmanical, Buddhist cult, 306 ; points of connection with Christian ritual, 307.—(c) The *Abhidharma-Piṭaka*, 307 ; schools of Buddhist philosophy, 308 ; relation to the Sāṃkhya-system, 308 ; and to Gnosticism, 309 — Commentaries on the sacred scriptures, 309 ; Tantras, 310.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES,	• • • • •	311
----------------------	-----------	-----

INDICES :

SANSKRIT INDEX,	329
INDEX OF MATTERS, &c,	353
INDEX OF AUTHORS,	358

LECTURES

ON THE

HISTORY OF INDIAN LITERATURE.

At the very outset of these lectures I find myself in a certain degree of perplexity, being rather at a loss how best to entitle them. I cannot say that they are to treat of the history of "Indian Literature," for then I should have to consider the whole body of Indian languages, including those of non-Aryan origin. Nor can I say that their subject is the history of "Indo-Aryan Literature;" for then I should have to discuss the modern languages of India also, which form a third period in the development of Indo-Aryan speech. Nor, lastly, can I say that they are to present a history of "Sanskrit Literature;" for the Indo-Aryan language is not in its first period "Sanskrit," *i.e.*, the language of the educated, but is still a popular dialect; while in its second period the people spoke not Sanskrit, but Prākṛitic dialects, which arose simultaneously with Sanskrit out of the ancient Indo-Aryan vernacular. In order, however, to relieve you from any doubt as to what you have to expect from me here, I may at once remark that it is only the literature of the first and second periods of the Indo-Aryan language with which we have to do. For the sake of brevity I retain the name "Indian Literature."

I shall frequently in the course of these lectures be forced to draw upon your forbearance. The subject they discuss may be compared to a yet uncultivated tract of

country, of which only a few spots have here and there been cleared, while the greater part of it remains covered with dense forest, impenetrable to the eye, and obstructing the prospect. A clearance is indeed now by degrees being made, but slowly, more especially because in addition to the natural obstacles which impede investigation, there still prevails a dense mist of prejudice and preconceived opinions hovering over the land, and enfolding it as with a veil.

The literature of India passes generally for the most ancient literature of which we possess written records, and justly so.¹ But the reasons which have hitherto been thought sufficient to establish this fact are not the correct ones; and it is indeed a matter for wonder that people should have been so long contented with them. In the first place, Indian tradition itself has been adduced in support of this fact, and for a very long time this was considered sufficient. It is, I think, needless for me to waste words upon the futile nature of such evidence. In the next place, astronomical data have been appealed to, according to which the Vedas would date from about 1400 B.C. But these data are given in writings, which are evidently of very modern origin, and they might consequently be the result of calculations² instituted for the express purpose. Fur-

¹ In so far as this claim may not now be disputed by the Egyptian monumental records and papyrus rolls, or even by the Assyrian literature which has but recently been brought to light.

² Besides, these calculations are of a very vague character, and do not yield any such definite date as that given above, but only some epoch lying between 1820-860 B.C., see *J. St.*, x. 236; Whitney in *Journ. R. A. S.*, i. 317, ff. (1864). True, the circumstance that the oldest records begin the series of *nakshatras* with the sign *Krittikā*, carries us back to a considerably earlier period even than these dates, derived from the so-called Vedic Calendar, viz., to a period between 2780-1820 B.C., since the vernal equinox coincided with η *Tauri* (*Krittikā*), in round numbers, about the year 2300 B.C., see *J. St.*, x. 234-236. But, on the

other hand, the opinion expressed in the first edition of this work (1852), to the effect that the Indians may either have brought the knowledge of these lunar mansions, headed by *Krittikā*, with them into India, or else have obtained it at a later period through the commercial relations of the Phœnicians with the Panjāb, has recently gained considerably in probability; and therewith the suggestion of Babylon as the mother country of the observations on which this date is established. See the second of my two treatises, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakshatra* (Berlin, 1862), pp. 362-400; my paper, *Ueber den Vedakalender Namens Jyotisha* (1862), p. 15; *J. St.*, x. 429. ix. 241, ff.; Whitney, *Oriental and Linguistic Studies* (1874), ii. 418.—Indeed a direct reference to Babylon and its sea trade, in which the exportation of peacocks is mentioned, has lately come to light

ther, one of the Buddhist eras has been relied upon, according to which a reformer is supposed to have arisen in the sixth century B.C., in opposition to the Brahmanical hierarchy; but the authenticity of this particular era is still extremely questionable. Lastly, the period when Pāṇini, the first systematic grammarian, flourished, has been referred to the fourth century B.C., and from this, as a starting-point, conclusions as to the period of literary development which preceded him have been deduced. But the arguments in favour of Pāṇini's having lived at that time³ are altogether weak and hypothetical, and in no case can they furnish us with any sort of solid basis.

The reasons, however, by which we are fully justified in regarding the literature of India as the most ancient literature of which written records on an extensive scale have been handed down to us, are these —

In the more ancient parts of the R̥gveda-Samhitā, we find the Indian race settled on the north-western borders of India, in the Panjāb, and even beyond the Panjāb, on the Kubhā, or *Κωφῆν*, in Kabul.⁴ The gradual spread of

of the Berlin Academy, p. 622 (1871). As, however, this testimony belongs to a comparatively late period, no great importance can be attached to it.—Direct evidence of ancient com-

would appear to have been already settled on the Indus. For the word *lapi*, 'ape,' which occurs in 1 Kings x. 22, in the form *qōf*, Gr. *κῆπος*, is

for peacocks (1 Kings x. 22, 2 Chron. ix. 21) necessarily implies that already in Solomon's time the Phœnician ophir-merchants "ont eu affaire soit au pays même des Abhira soit sur un autre point de la côte de

l'Inde avec des peuplades dravidiennes," Julien Vinson, *Revue de Linguistique*, vi. 120, ff. (1873). See also Burnell, *Elements of South Indian Palæography*, p. 5 (Mangalore, 1874).

³ Or even, as Goldstucker supposes, earlier than Buddha.

⁴ One of the Vedic Rishis, asserted to be Vatsa, of the family of Kaṇva, extols, Rik, viii. 6. 46-48, the splendid presents, consisting of horses, cattle, and *ushtras* yoked four together—(Roth in the St. Petersburg Diet. explains *ushtra* as 'buffalo, humped bull; 'generally it means 'camel')—which, to the glory of the Yādvas, he received whilst residing with Tirimdira and Parśu. Or have we here only a single person, Tirimdira Parśu? In the Śāṅkhayana Śrauta-Sūtra, xvi. 11. 20, at least, he is understood as Tirimdira Pārasavya. These names suggest Tiridates and the Persians; see *L.St.* iv. 379, n., but compare Girard de Rualle, *Revue de Linguist.*, iv. 227 (1872). Of course, we must not think of the

the race from these seats towards the east, beyond the Sarasvatí and over Hindustán as far as the Ganges, can be traced in the later portions of the Vedic writings almost step by step. The writings of the following period, that of the epic, consist of accounts of the internal conflicts among the conquerors of Hindustán themselves, as, for instance, the Mahá-Bhárata; or of the farther spread of Brahmanism towards the south, as, for instance, the Rá-máyana. If we connect with this the first fairly accurate information about India which we have from a Greek source, viz., from Megasthenes,* it becomes clear that at the time of this writer the Brahmanising of Hindustán was already completed, while at the time of the Periplus (see Lassen, *I. AK.*, ii. 150, n.; *I. St.*, ii. 192) the very southernmost point of the Dekhan had already become a seat of the worship of the wife of Śiva. What a series of years, of centuries, must necessarily have elapsed before this boundless tract of country, inhabited by wild and vigorous tribes, could have been brought over to Brahmanism!! It may perhaps here be objected that the races and tribes found by Alexander on the banks of the Indus appear to stand entirely on a Vedic, and not on a Brahmanical footing. As a matter of fact this is true; but we should not be justified in drawing from this any conclusion whatever with regard to India itself. For these peoples of the Pan-jáb never submitted to the Brahmanical order of things, but always retained their ancient Vedic standpoint, free and independent, without either priestly domination or system of caste. For this reason, too, they were the objects of a cordial hatred on the part of their kinsmen, who had wandered farther on, and on this account also Buddhism gained an easy entrance among them.

Persians after Cyrus: that would bring us too far down. But the Persians were so called, and had their own princes, even before the time of Cyrus. Or ought we rather, as suggested by Olshausen in the *Berliner Monatsberichte* (1874), p. 708, to think of the Parthavas, i.e., Parthians, who as well as Pársas are mentioned in the time of the Achæmenidæ? The derivation, hitherto

current, of the word Tiri in Tiridates, &c., from the Pahlavi *tír* = Zend *tis-trya* (given, e.g., by M. Bréal, *De Persicis nominibus* (1863), pp. 9, 10), is hardly justified.

* Who as ambassador of Seleucus resided for some time at the court of Chandragupta. His reports are preserved to us chiefly in the *Indicæ* of Arrian, who lived in the second century A.D.

And while the claims of the written records of Indian literature to a high antiquity—its beginnings may perhaps be traced back even to the time when the Indo-Aryans still dwelt together with the Persa-Aryans—are thus indisputably proved by external, geographical testimony, the internal evidence in the same direction which may be gathered from their contents, is no less conclusive. In the songs of the Rik, the robust spirit of the people gives expression to the feeling of its relation to nature, with a spontaneous freshness and simplicity; the powers of nature are worshipped as superior beings, and their kindly aid besought within their several spheres. Beginning with this nature-worship, which everywhere recognises only the individual phenomena of nature, and these in the first instance as superhuman, we trace in Indian literature the progress of the Hindú people through almost all the phases of religious development.

These powers, now gradually classified within their different spheres; and a certain unity is discovered among them. Thus we arrive at a number of divine beings, each exercising supreme sway within its particular province, whose influence is in course of time further extended to the corresponding events of human life, while at the same time they are endowed with human attributes and organs. The number—already considerable—of these natural deities, these regents of the powers of nature, is further increased by the addition of abstractions, taken from ethical relations; and to these as to the other deities divine powers, personal existence, and activity are ascribed. Into this multitude of divine figures, the spirit of inquiry seeks at a later stage to introduce order, by classifying and co-ordinating them according to their principal bearings. The principle followed in this distribution is, like the conception of the deities themselves, entirely borrowed from the contemplation of nature. We have the gods who act in the heavens, in the air, upon the earth; and of these the sun, the wind, and fire are recognised as the main representatives and rulers respectively. These three gradually obtain precedence over all the other gods, who are only looked upon as their creatures and servants. Strength-

logical dates. We must reconcile ourselves to the fact that any such search will, as a general rule, be absolutely fruitless. It is only in the case of those branches of literature which also became known abroad, and also in regard to the last few centuries, when either the dates of manuscripts, or the data given in the introductions or closing observations of the works themselves, furnish us some guidance, that we can expect any result. Apart from this, an internal chronology based on the character of the works themselves, and on the quotations, &c., therein contained, is the only one possible.

Indian literature divides itself into two great periods, the Vedic and the Sanskrit. Turning now to the former, or Vedic period, I proceed to give a preliminary general outline of it before entering into the details.

will come next under our consideration, and which, providing as they do for a practical want, became necessary immediately upon the institution of a worship with a fixed ritual. For the Samhitá of the Sáman, and both the Samhitás of the Yajus, consist only of such *richas* (verses) and sacrificial formulas as had to be recited at the ceremonies of the Soma offering and other sacrifices, and in the same order in which they were practically used; at least, we know for certain, that this is the case in the Yajus. The Samhitá of the Sáman contains nothing but verses (*richas*); those of the Yajus, sentences in prose also. The former, the *richas*, all recur, with a few exceptions, in the Rik-Samhitá, so that the Sáma-Samhitá is nothing more than an extract from the songs of the latter, of the verses applied to the Soma offering. Now the *richas* found in the Sáma-Samhitá and Yajuh-Samhitá appear in part in a very altered form, deviating considerably from the text of the Rik, the Rik-Samhitá. Of this a triple explanation is possible. First, these readings may be earlier and more original than those of the Rik, liturgical use having protected them from alteration, while the simple song, not being immediately connected with the sacred rite, was less scrupulously preserved. Or, secondly, they may be later than those of the Rik, and may have arisen from the necessity of precisely adapting the text to the meaning attributed to the verse in its application to the ceremony. Or, lastly, they may be of equal authority with those of the Rik, the discrepancies being merely occasioned by the variety of districts and families in which they were used, the text being most authentic in the district and family in which it originated, and less so in those to which it subsequently passed. All three methods of explanation are alike correct, and in each particular case they must all be kept in view. But if we look more closely at the relation of these verses, it may be stated thus: The *richas* occurring in the Sáma-Samhitá generally stamp themselves as older and more original by the greater antiquity of their grammatical forms; those in the two Samhitás of the Yajus, on the contrary, generally give the impression of having undergone a secondary alteration. Instances which come under the third method of explanation are found in equal

rally defined: Their object is to
 songs and formulas with the sa
 out, on the one hand, direc
 the other, their cc
 In setting forth the
 in its details: ly
 directly explain el
 into its constit ai
 nection dogma
 tion. We thu
 the oldest ling
 natives, and
 peculiar cha
 this class, y
 their individ
 this or that
 all date from
 civilisation a
 and social ord
 transition, an
 its commence
 tion.* The

individual sage

as su

The

sacrificial
 by pointing
 on

do.
 mo
 bec
 pres
 this
 state
 ced
 such
 necti
 [I. S.
 Brāhm.
 in the S.

tatives, were made in different districts by individuals particularly qualified for the task. But whether these compilations or digests were now actually written down, or were still transmitted orally only, remains uncertain. The latter supposition would seem probable from the fact that of the same work we here and there find two texts entirely differing in their details. Nothing definite, however, can be said on the subject, for in these cases there may possibly have been some fundamental difference in the original, or even a fresh treatment of the material. It was, moreover, but natural that these compiles should frequently come into collision and conflict with each other. Hence we have now and then to remark the exhibition of strong animosity against those who in the author's opinion are heterodox. The preponderant influence gradually gained by some of these works over the rest—whether by reason of their intrinsic value, or of the fact that their author appealed more to the *liṅgimāntrī* spirit—has resulted, unfortunately for us, in the preservation of these only, while works representative of the disputed opinions have for the most part disappeared. Here and there perhaps in India some fragments may still be found; in general, however, here as everywhere in Indian literature, we encounter the lamentable fact that the works which, in the end, came off victorious, have almost entirely supplanted and effaced their predecessors. After all a comparatively large number of Brahmanas is still extant—a circumstance which is evidently owing to the fact that a sort of petty jealousy had always prevailed among the families in which the study of the different Vedas was hereditarily transmitted. Thus in the case of each Veda, such works at least as had come to be considered of the highest authority have been preserved, although the practical significance of the Brahmanas was

gh there
is *Śruti*,
bject of
ed, and
timated
mselves
re con-
Śruti is
Sūtras,
g use of
l by the
ounde l

the etymo-
or regard-
ling-line.
[This is
Petera-
writing of
e origin.
rack and
ol, p. 254.
p. 127.
with Indian
served in
for secular
ed sub-
ce Muller,
v. 20, ff.
(Pāṇini),
that the
just abou-
writer
A. E. : xii.
logy lead
it in the
and in the
'collabor-
to come in

* The difficulty of their preservation is also an important factor in the case, as at that time writing either did not exist at all, or at any rate was but seldom employed. [In considering the question of the age and extent of the use of writing in India, it is important to point out that the want of suitable materials, in the North at least, for the introduction of paper, must have been a great obstacle to general use.]

gradually more and more lost, and passed over to the Sūtras, &c. To the number of the Brāhmanas, or recensions of the Samhitās, which were thus lost, belong those of the Vāshkalas, Paiṅgins, Bhāllavins, Śātyāyanins, Kālabavins, Lāmakāyanins, Śāmbuvis, Khādāyanins, and Śālaṅkāyanins, which we find quoted on various occasions in writings of this class; besides all the Chhandas works (Samhitās) specified in the *gaṇa* 'Śaunaka' (Pān., iv. 3. 106), whose names are not so much as mentioned elsewhere.

The difference between the Brāhmanas of the several Vedas as to subject-matter is essentially this: The Brāhmanas of the Rik, in their exposition of the ritual, generally specify those duties only which fell to the Hotar, or reciter of the *richas*, whose office it was to collect from the various hymns the verses suited to each particular occasion, as its *śāstra* (canon). The Brāhmanas of the Sāman confine themselves to the duties of the Udgātar, or singer of the *sāmans*; the Brāhmanas of the Yajus, to the duties of the Adhvaryu, or actual performer of the sacrifice. In the Brāhmanas of the Rik, the order of the sacrificial performance is on the whole preserved, whereas the sequence of the hymns as they occur in the Rik-Samhitā is not attended to at all. But in the Brāhmanas of the Sāman and Yajus, we find a difference corresponding to the fact that their Samhitās are already adapted to the proper order of the ritual. The Brāhmaṇa of the Sāman enters but seldom into the explanation of individual verses; the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus, on the contrary, may be almost considered as a running dogmatic commentary on its Samhitā, to the order of which it adheres so strictly, that in the case of its omitting one or more verses, we might perhaps be justified in concluding that they did not then form part of the Samhitā. A supplement also has been added to this Brāhmaṇa for some of those books of the Samhitā which were incorporated with it at a period subsequent to its original compilation, so that the Brāhmaṇa comprises 100 *adhyāyas* instead of 60, as formerly seems to have been the case. The Brāhmaṇa of the Black Yajus does not, as we shall see further on, differ in its contents, but only in point of time, from its Samhitā. It is, in fact, a supplement to it. The Brāhmaṇa of the

Atharvan is up to the present time unknown, though there are manuscripts of it in England⁸

The common name for the Bráhmaṇa literature is *Śruti*, 'hearing,' i.e., that which is subject of hearing, subject of exposition, of teaching, by which name their learned, and consequently exclusive, character is sufficiently intimated. In accordance with this we find in the works themselves frequent warnings against intrusting the knowledge contained in them to any profane person. The name *Śruti* is not indeed mentioned in them, but only in the *Sūtras*, though it is perfectly justified by the corresponding use of the verb *śru* which occurs in them frequently.

The third stage in Vedic literature is represented by the *Sūtras*.^{*} These are, upon the whole, essentially founded

⁸ It has since been published, see below. It presents no sort of direct internal relation to the *Ath Samhitā*.

^{*} The word *Sūtra* in the above

'thread,' 'band,' cf. Lat. *sutur*. Would it be correct to regard it as an expression analogous to the German *band* (volume)? If so, the term would have to be understood of the fastening together of the leaves, and would necessarily presuppose the existence of writing (in the same way, perhaps, as *grantha* does, a term first occurring in Pāṇini). Inquiry into the origin of Indian

for taking exception to the etymology just proposed, and for regarding the signification 'guiding-line,' 'clue,' as the original one. [This is the meaning given in the St. Petersburg Dictionary.—The writing of the Indians is of Semitic origin: see Benfey, *Indien* (in *Ersch and Gruber's Encyclopædia*, 1840), p. 254; my *Indische Skizzen* (1856), p. 127, ff.; Burnell, *Elem. of South Indian Pal*, p. 3, ff. Probably it served in the first instance merely for secular purposes, and was only applied subsequently to literature. See Müller, *Anc. S. Lit.*, p. 507; *I. St.*, v. 20, ff.; *I. Str.*, ii. 339. Goldstucker (*Pāṇini*, 1860, p. 26, ff.) contends that the words *sūtra* and *grantha* must absolutely be connected with writing. See, however, *I. St.*, v. 24, ff.; xiii. 476.]—Nor does etymology lead us to a more certain result in the case of another word found in this connection, viz., *akṣara*, 'syllable.' This word does not seem to occur in this sense in the *Samhitā* of the Rik (or *Sāmān*); it there rather signifies 'imperishable.' The connecting link between this primary signification and the meaning 'syllable,' which is first met with in the *Samhitā* of the Yajus, might perhaps be the idea of writing, the latter being the making imperishable, as it were, of oral

must refer the origin of the *Sūtras*. But as these were composed chiefly with a view to their being committed to memory—a fact which follows from their form, and partly accounts for it—there might be good grounds

on the Brāhmaṇas, and must be considered as their necessary supplement, as a further advance in the path struck out by the latter in the direction of more rigid system and formalism.⁹ While the Brāhmaṇas, with the view of explaining the sacrifice and supporting it by authority, &c., uniformly confine themselves to individual instances of ritual, interpretation, tradition, and speculation, subjecting these to copious dogmatic treatment, the object of the Sūtras is to comprehend everything that had any reference whatever to these subjects. The mass of matter became too great; there was risk of the tenor of the whole being lost in the details; and it gradually became impossible to discuss all the different particulars consecutively. Diffuse discussion of the details had to be replaced by concise collective summaries of them. The utmost brevity was, however, requisite in condensing this great mass, in order to avoid overburdening the memory; and this brevity ultimately led to a remarkably compressed and enigmatical style, which was more and more cultivated as the literature of the Sūtras became more independent, and in proportion as the resulting advantages became apparent. Thus the more ancient a Sūtra, the more intelligible it is; the more enigmatical it is, the more modern will it prove.*

But the literature of the Sūtras can by no means be said to rest entirely upon the Brāhmaṇas, for these, as a rule, give too exclusive a prominence to the ritual of the sacrifice. Indeed, it is only one particular division of the Sūtras—viz., the Kalpa-Sūtras, aphorisms exclusively devoted to the consideration of this ritual¹⁰—which bears

fleeting and evanescent words and syllables (!). Or is the notion of the imperishable λόγος at the root of this signification? [In the *Errata* to the first German edition it was pointed out, on the authority of a communication received from Professor Aufrecht, that *akshara* is twice used in the Rik of the 'measuring of speech,' viz., i. 164. 24 (47), and ix. 13. 3, and consequently may there mean 'syllable.' According to the St. Petersburg Dictionary, this latter meaning is to be derived from the idea of 'the constant, simple' element in language.]

⁹ On the mutual relations of the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, see also *I. St.*, viii. 76, 77; ix. 353, 354.

* Precisely as in the case of the Brāhmaṇas, so also in the case of the Kalpas, i.e., Kalpa-Sūtras, Pāṇini, iv. 3. 105, distinguishes those composed by the ancients from those that are nearer to his own time.

¹⁰ On the sacrifice and sacrificial implements of the Śrauta-Sūtras, see M. Müller in *Z. D. M. G.*, IX. xxxvi.-lxxxii.; Haug's notes to his translation of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa; and my paper, *Zur Kenntniss des vedischen Opferrituals*, *I. St.*, x. xiii.

the special name of Śrauta-Sūtras, i.e., "Sūtras founded on the Śruti." The sources of the other Sūtras must be sought elsewhere.

Side by side with the Śrauta-Sūtras we are met by a second family of ritual Sūtras, the so-called Gṛhya-Sūtras, which treat of domestic ceremonies, those celebrated at birth and before it, at marriage, as well as at death and after it. The origin of these works is sufficiently indicated by their title, since, in addition to the name of Gṛhya-Sūtras, they also bear that of Smārta-Sūtras, i.e., "Sūtras founded on the Smṛiti." *Smṛiti*, 'memory,' i.e., that which is the subject of memory, can evidently only be distinguished from *Śruti*, 'hearing,' i.e., that which is the subject of hearing, in so far as the former impresses itself on the memory directly, without special instruction or provision for the purpose. It belongs to all, it is the law of the whole people, it is supported by the consensus of the people, therefore need to be specially enacted. The laws are common property.

On the contrary, though in common consciousness, speculations and far the property instances, under the influence of the law, inspire the people with a due awe of the and sanctity of their institutions. It is not, to be assumed from this that Smṛiti, custom and law, do not also undergo considerable alterations in the course of time. The mass of the immigrants had a great deal too much on their hands in the subjugation of the aborigines to be in a position to occupy themselves with other matters. Their whole energies had, in the first instance, to be concentrated upon the necessity of holding their own against the enemy. When this had been effected, and resistance was broken down, they awoke suddenly to find themselves bound and shackled in the hands of other and far more powerful enemies; or rather, they did not awake at all; their physical powers had been so long and so exclusively exercised and expended to the detriment of their intellectual energy, that the latter had gradually dwindled away altogether. The history of these new enemies was this: The knowledge of the ancient songs

with which, in their ancient homes, the Indians had worshipped the powers of nature, and the knowledge of the ritual connected with these songs, became more and more the exclusive property of those whose ancestors perhaps composed them, and in whose families this knowledge had been hereditary. These same families remained in the possession of the traditions connected with them, and which were necessary to their explanation. To strangers in a foreign country, anything brought with them from home becomes invested with a halo of sacredness; and thus it came about that these families of singers became families of priests, whose influence was more and more consolidated in proportion as the distance between the people and their former home increased, and the more their ancient institutions were banished from their minds by external struggles. The guardians of the ancestral customs, of the primitive forms of worship, in an increasingly prominent position, became the enigmatics of these, and, finally, the representatives as the literature itself. For so ably had they used their office, and in proportion that they succeeded in founding a hierarchy the apparent which the world has never seen. To this position it is probable that have been scarcely possible for them to attain but it proves a preserving climate of Hindustán, and the mode of these, as by it, which exercised a deteriorating influence on a race unaccustomed to it. The families also, of a petty kings who had formerly reigned over individual tribes, held a more prominent position in the larger kingdoms which were of necessity founded in Hindustán, and thus arose the military caste. Lastly, the people proper, the *Viśas*, or settlers, united to form a third caste, and they in their turn naturally reserved to themselves prerogatives over the fourth caste, or *Súdras*. This last was composed of various mixed elements, partly, perhaps, of an Aryan race which had settled earlier in India, partly of the aborigines themselves, and partly again of those among the immigrants, or their Western kinsmen, who refused adherence to the new Brahmanical order. The royal

* Who were distinguished by their colour, for caste. [See *I. St.*, x. 4. very colour from the three other 10.]
castes; hence the name *varṇa*, i.e.

families, the warriors, who, it may be supposed, strenuously supported the priesthood so long as it was a question of robbing the people of their rights, now that this was effected turned against their former allies, and sought to throw off the yoke that was likewise laid upon them. These efforts were, however, unavailing; the colossus was too firmly established. Obscure legends and isolated allusions are the only records left to us in the later writings, of the sacrilegious hands which ventured to attack the sacred and divinely consecrated majesty of the Brahmans; and these are careful to note, at the same time, the terrible punishments which befell those impious offenders. The fame of many a Barbarossa has here passed away and been forgotten!

The Smárta-Sútras, which led to this digression, generally exhibit the complete standpoint of Brahmanism. Whether in the form of actual records or of compositions orally transmitted, they in any case date from a period when more than men cared to lose of the Smṛiti—that precious tradition passed on from generation to generation—was in danger of perishing. Though, as we have just seen, it had undergone considerable modifications, even in the families who guarded it, through the influence of the Brahmans, yet this influence was chiefly exercised with reference to its political bearings, leaving domestic manners and customs¹¹ untouched in their ancient form; so that these works cover a rich treasure of ideas and conceptions of extreme antiquity. It is in them also that we have to look for the beginnings of the Hindú legal literature,¹² whose subject-matter, indeed, in part corresponds exactly to theirs, and whose authors bear for the most part the same names as those of the Grihya-Sútras. With the strictly legal portions of the law-books, those dealing with

¹¹ For the ritual relating to birth see Speijer's book on the *Játakarma* (Leyden, 1872)—for the marriage ceremonies, Haas's paper, *Ueber die Heirathsgebräuche der alten Inder*, with additions by myself in *I. St.*, v. 267, ff.; also my paper *Vedische Hochzeitsprüche*, *ibid.*, p. 177, ff. (1862)—on the burial of the dead, both in *Z. D. M. G.*, viii. 487, ff.

(1854), and M. Muller, *ibid.*, IX. 1.—xxxvi. (1855); and lastly, O. Donner's *Pindapatriyajña* (1870).

¹² Besides the Grihya-Sútras we find some texts directly called Dharma-Sútras, or Sāmāyachārika-Sútras, which are specified as portions of Śrauta-Sútras, but which were no doubt subsequently inserted into these.

civil law, criminal law, and political law, we do not, it is true, find more than a few points of connection in these Sūtras; but probably these branches were not codified at all until the pressure of actual imminent danger made it necessary to establish them on a secure foundation. The risk of their gradually dying out was, owing to the constant operation of the factors involved, not so great as in the case of domestic customs. But a far more real peril threatened them in the fierce assaults directed against the Brahmanical polity by the gradually increasing power of Buddhism. Buddhism originally proceeded purely from theoretical heterodoxy regarding the relation of matter to spirit, and similar questions; but in course of time it addressed itself to practical points of religion and worship, and thenceforth it imperilled the very existence of Brahmanism, since the military caste and the oppressed classes of the people generally availed themselves of its aid in order to throw off the overwhelming yoke of priestly domination. The statement of Megasthenes, that the Indians in his time administered law only ἀπὸ μνήμης, 'from memory,' I hold therefore to be perfectly correct, and I can see no grounds for the view that μνήμη is but a mistranslation of Smṛiti in the sense of Smṛiti-Sāstra, 'a treatise on Smṛiti.'* For the above-mentioned reason, however—in consequence of the development of Buddhism into an anti-Brahmanical religion—the case may have altered soon afterwards, and a code, that of Manu, for example (founded on the Mānava Gṛihya-Sūtra), may have been drawn up. But this work belongs not to the close of the Vedic, but to the beginning of the following period.

As we have found, in the Smṛiti, an independent basis for the Gṛihya-Sūtras—in addition to the Brāhmaṇas, where but few points of contact with these Sūtras can be traced—so too shall we find an independent basis for those Sūtras the contents of which relate to language. In this case it is in the recitation of the songs and formulas at the sacrifice that we shall find it. Although, accordingly, these

* This latter view has been best set forth by Schwanbeck, *Megasthenes*, pp. 50, 51. [But see also Bur-

nell, *Elements of S. Ind. Palæogr.*, p. 4.]

Sútras stand on a level with the Bráhmaṇas, which owe their origin to the same source, yet this must be understood as applying only to those views on linguistic relations which, being presupposed in the Sútras, must be long anterior to them. It must not be taken as applying to the works themselves, inasmuch as they present the results of these antecedent investigations in a collected and systematic form. Obviously also, it was a much more natural thing to attempt, in the first instance, to elucidate the relation of the prayer to the sacrifice, than to make the form in which the prayer itself was drawn up a subject of investigation. The more sacred the sacrificial performance grew, and the more fixed the form of worship gradually became, the greater became the importance of the prayers belonging to it, and the stronger their claim to the utmost possible purity and safety. To effect this, it was necessary, first, to fix the text of the prayers; secondly, to establish a correct pronunciation and recitation; and, lastly, to preserve the tradition of their origin. It was only after the lapse of time, and when by degrees their literal sense had become foreign to the phase into which the language had passed—and thus was of course much later the case with the priests, who were familiar with them, than with the people at large—that it became necessary to take precautions for securing and establishing the sense also. To attain all these objects, those most conversant with the subject were obliged to give instruction to the ignorant, and circles were thus formed around them of
 images from one teacher
 re attracted by the fame
 rches were naturally not
 but embraced the whole
 range of Brahmanical theology, extending in like manner to questions of worship, dogma, and speculation, all of which, indeed, were closely interwoven with each other. We must, at any rate, assume among the Brahmans of this period a very stirring intellectual life, in which even the women took an active part, and which accounts still further for the superiority maintained and exercised by the Brahmans over the rest of the people. Nor did the military caste hold aloof from these inquiries, especially after they had succeeded in securing a time of repose from

external warfare. We have here a faithful copy of the scholastic period of the Middle Ages; sovereigns whose courts form the centres of intellectual life; Brahmans who with lively emulation carry on their inquiries into the highest questions the human mind can propound; women who with enthusiastic ardour plunge into the mysteries of speculation, impressing and astonishing men by the depth and loftiness of their opinions, and who—while in a state which, judging from description, seems to have been a kind of somnambulism—solve the questions proposed to them on sacred subjects. As to the quality of their solutions, and the value of all these inquiries generally, that is another matter. But neither have the scholastic subtleties any absolute worth in themselves; it is only the striving and the effort which ennobles the character of any such period.

The advance made by linguistic research during this epoch was very considerable. It was then that the text of the prayers was fixed, that the redaction of the various Samhitās took place. By degrees, very extensive precautions were taken for this purpose. For their study (Pátha), as well as for the different methods of preserving them—whether by writing or by memory, for either is possible¹³—such special injunctions are given, that it seems

¹³ All the technical terms, however, which occur for study of the Veda and the like, uniformly refer to speaking and reciting only, and thereby point to exclusively oral tradition. The writing down of the Vedic texts seems indeed not to have taken place until a comparatively late period. See *I. St.*, v. 18, ff. (1861). Müller, *Anc. S. Lit.*, p. 507, ff. (1859); Westergaard, *Ueber den ältesten Zeitraum der indischen Geschichte* (1860, German translation 1862, p. 42, ff.); and Haug, *Ueber das Wesen des vedischen Accents* (1873, p. 16, ff.), have declared themselves in favour of this theory. Haug thinks that those Brahmans who were converted to Buddhism were the first who consigned the Veda to writing—for polemical purposes—and that they were followed

by the rest of the Brahmans. On the other hand, Goldstücker, Böhtlingk, Whitney, and Roth (*Der Atharvaveda in Kashmir*, p. 10), are of the opposite opinion, holding, in particular, that the authors of the Prātisākyas must have had written texts before them. Benfey also formerly shared this view, but recently (*Einleitung in die Grammatik der ved. Sprache*, p. 31), he has expressed the belief that the Vedic texts were only committed to writing at a late date, long subsequent to their 'diaskeuasis.' Burnell also, *l. c.*, p. 10, is of opinion that, amongst other things, the very scarcity of the material for writing in ancient times "almost precludes the existence of MSS. of books or long documents."

all but impossible that any alteration in the text, except in the form of interpolation, can have taken place since. These directions, as well as those relating to the pronunciation and recitation of the words, are laid down in the *Prátisákhyas*, writings with which we have but recently been made acquainted.* Such a *Prátisákhyas*-*Sútra* uniformly attaches itself to the *Samhitá* of a single Veda only, but it embraces all the schools belonging to it; it gives the general regulations as to the nature of the sounds employed, the euphonic rules observed, the accent and its modifications, the modulation of the voice, &c. Further, all the individual cases in which peculiar phonetic or other changes are observed are specially pointed out;† and we are in this way supplied with an excellent critical means of arriving at the form of the text of each *Samhitá* at the time when its *Prátisákhyas* was composed. If we find in any part of the *Samhitá* phonetic peculiarities which we are unable to trace in its *Prátisákhyas*, we may rest assured that at that period this part did not yet belong to the *Samhitá*. The directions as to the recital of the Veda, i.e., of its *Samhitá*,‡ in the schools—each individual word being repeated in a variety of connections—present a very lively picture of the care with which these studies were pursued.

For the knowledge of metre also, rich materials have been handed down to us in the *Sútras*. The singers of the hymns themselves must naturally have been cognisant of the metrical laws observed in them. But we also find the technical names of some metres now and then mentioned in the later songs of the *Rík*. In the *Bráhmaṇas* the oddest tricks are played with them, and their harmony is in some mystical fashion brought into connection with the harmony of the world, in fact stated to be its funda-

* By Roth in his essays, *Zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Veda*, p. 53, ff (translated in *Journ. As. Soc. Bengal*, January 1848, p. 6, ff).

† This indeed is the real purpose of the *Prátisákhyas*, namely, to show how the continuous *Samhitá* text is to be reconstructed out of the *Pada* text, in which the individual words of the text are given

separately in their original form, unaffected by *samdhī*, i.e., the influence of the words which immediately precede and follow. Whatever else, over and above this, is found in the *Prátisákhyas* is merely accessory matter. See Whitney in *Journal Am. Or. Soc.*, iv. 259 (1853).

‡ Strictly speaking, only these (the *Samhitás*) are Veda.

external warfare. We have here a faithful copy of the scholastic period of the Middle Ages; sovereigns whose courts form the centres of intellectual life; Brahmins who with lively emulation carry on their inquiries into the highest questions the human mind can propound; women who with enthusiastic ardour plunge into the mysteries of speculation, impressing and astonishing men by the depth and loftiness of their opinions, and who—while in a state which, judging from description, seems to have been a kind of somnambulism—solve the questions proposed to them on sacred subjects. As to the quality of their solutions, and the value of all these inquiries generally, that is another matter. But neither have the scholastic subtleties any absolute worth in themselves; it is only the striving and the effort which ennoble the character of any such period.

The advance made by linguistic research during this epoch was very considerable. It was then that the text of the prayers was fixed, that the redaction of the various Samhitās took place. By degrees, very extensive precautions were taken for this purpose. For their study (Pátha), as well as for the different methods of preserving them—whether by writing or by memory, for either is possible¹³—such special injunctions are given, that it seems

¹³ All the technical terms, however, which occur for study of the Veda and the like, uniformly refer to speaking and reciting only, and thereby point to exclusively oral tradition. The writing down of the Vedic texts seems indeed not to have taken place until a comparatively late period. See *I. St.*, v. 18, ff. (1861). Müller, *Anc. S. Lit.*, p. 507, ff. (1859): Westergaard, *Über den ältesten Zeitraum der indischen Geschichte* (1860, German translation 1862, p. 42, ff.); and Haug, *Ueber das Wesen des vedischen Accents* (1873, p. 16, ff.), have declared themselves in favour of this theory. Haug thinks that those Brahmins who were converted to Buddhism were the first who consigned the Veda to writing—for polemical purposes—and that they were followed

by the rest of the Brahmins. On the other hand, Goldstücker, Böhtlingk, Whitney, and Roth (*Der Atharvaveda in Kashmir*, p. 10), are of the opposite opinion, holding, in particular, that the authors of the Prātisākhya must have had written texts before them. Benfey also formerly shared this view, but recently (*Einleitung in die Grammatik der ved. Sprache*, p. 31), he has expressed the belief that the Vedic texts were only committed to writing at a late date, long subsequent to their 'diaskeuasis.' Burnell also, *l. c.*, p. 10, is of opinion that, amongst other things, the very scarcity of the material for writing in ancient times "almost precludes the existence of MSS. of books or long documents."

all but impossible that any alteration in the text, except in the form of interpolation, can have taken place since. These directions, as well as those relating to the pronunciation and recitation of the words, are laid down in the *Prātisákhyas*, writings with which we have but recently been made acquainted.* Such a *Prātisákhyas*-*Sútra* uniformly attaches itself to the *Samhitá* of a single Veda only, but it embraces all the schools belonging to it; it gives the general regulations as to the nature of the sounds employed, the euphonic rules observed, the accent and its modifications, the modulation of the voice, &c. Further, all the individual cases in which peculiar phonetic or other changes are observed are specially pointed out;† and we are in this way supplied with an excellent critical means of arriving at the form of the text of each *Samhitá* at the time when its *Prātisákhyas* was composed. If we find in any part of the *Samhitá* phonetic peculiarities which we are unable to trace in its *Prātisákhyas*, we may rest assured that at that period this part did not yet belong to the *Samhitá*. The directions as to the recital of the Veda, i.e., of its *Samhitá*,‡ in the schools—each individual word being repeated in a variety of connections—present a very lively picture of the care with which these studies were pursued.

For the knowledge of metre also, rich materials have been handed down to us in the *Sútras*. The singers of the hymns themselves must naturally have been cognisant of the metrical laws observed in them. But we also find the technical names of some metres now and then mentioned in the later songs of the *Rik*. In the *Bráhmaṇas* the oddest tricks are played with them, and their harmony is in some mystical fashion brought into connection with the harmony of the world, in fact stated to be its funda-

* By Roth in his essays, *Zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Weda*, p. 53, ff. (translated in *Journ. As. Soc. Bengal*, January 1848, p. 6, ff).

† This indeed is the real purpose of the *Prātisákhyas*, namely, to show how the continuous *Samhitá* text is to be reconstructed out of the *Pada* text, in which the individual words of the text are given

separately in their original form, unaffected by *anviti* &c. &c. &c.

in the *Prātisákhyas* is merely accessory matter. See Whitney in *Journ. Am. Or. Soc.*, iv. 259 (1853).

‡ Strictly speaking, only these (the *Samhitás*) are Veda.

mental cause. The simple minds of these thinkers were too much charmed by their rhythm not to be led into these and similar symbolisings. The further development of metre afterwards led to special inquiries into its laws. Such investigations have been preserved to us, both in Sūtras¹⁵ treating directly of metre, *e.g.*, the Nidāna-Sūtra, and in the Anukramanīs, a peculiar class of works, which, adhering to the order of each Saṃhitā, assign a poet, a metre, and a deity to each song or prayer. They may, therefore, perhaps belong to a later period than most of the Sūtras, to a time when the text of each Saṃhitā was already extant in its final form, and distributed as we there find it into larger and smaller sections for the better regulation of its study. One of the smallest sections formed the pupil's task on each occasion.—The preservation of the tradition concerning the authors and the origin of the prayers is too intimately connected herewith to be dissociated from the linguistic Sūtras, although the class of works to which it gave rise is of an entirely different character. The most ancient of such traditions are to be found, as above stated, in the Bráhmaṇas themselves. These latter also contain legends regarding the origin and the author of this or that particular form of worship; and on such occasions the Bráhmaṇa frequently appeals to Gáthás, or stanzas, preserved by oral transmission among the people. It is evidently in these legends that we must look for the origin of the more extensive Itihásas and Purāṇas, works which but enlarged the range of their subject, but which in every other respect proceeded after the same fashion, as is shown by several of the earlier fragments preserved, *e.g.*, in the Mahá-Bhárata. The most ancient work of the kind hitherto known is the Brihaddevatá by Śaunaka, in *ślokas*, which, however, strictly follows the order of the Rik-Saṃhitā, and proves by its very title that it has only an accidental connection with this class of works. Its object properly is to specify the deity for each verse of the Rik-Saṃhitā. But in so doing, it supports its views with so many legends, that we are fully justified in classing it here. It, however, like the other Anukramanīs, belongs to a much later period than most

¹⁵ See Part i. of my paper on Indian Prosody, *J. St.*, viii. 1, ff. (1863).

of the Sūtras, since it presupposes Yāska, the author of the Nirukti, of whom I have to speak presently; it is, in fact, essentially based upon his work. [See Adalb. Kuhn in *J. St.*, i. 101–120]

It was remarked above, that the investigations into the literal sense of the prayers only began when this sense had gradually become somewhat obscure, and that, as this could not be the case among the priests, who were familiar with it, so soon as amongst the rest of the people, the language of the latter may at that time have undergone considerable modifications. The first step taken to render the prayers intelligible was to make a collection of synonyms, which, by virtue of their very arrangement, ex-

These
“strung together,” *Nigranthu*, corrupted into *Nighanṭu*,* and those occupied with them *Naighanṭukas*. One work of this kind has been actually preserved to us¹⁶ It is in five books, of which the three first contain synonyms; the fourth, a list of specially difficult Vedic words; and the fifth, a classification of the various divine personages who figure in the Veda. We also possess one of the ancient expositions of this work, a commentary on it, called *Nirukti*, “interpretation,” of which Yāska is said to be the author. It consists of twelve books, to which two others having no proper connection with them were afterwards added. It is reckoned by the Indians among the so-called Vedāṅgas, together with Śikshā, Chhandas, and Jyotisha—three very late treatises on phonetics, metre, and astronomical calculations—and also with Kalpa and Vyākaraṇa, i.e., ceremonial and grammar, two general categories of literary works. The four first names likewise originally signified the class in general,¹⁷ and it was only later that they were applied to the four individual works

* See Roth, Introduction to the Nirukti, p. xii.

¹⁶ To this place belong, further, the *Nighanṭu* to the Atharva-S, mentioned by Haug (cf. *J. St.*, ix. 175, 176,) and the *Nigama-Parīśiṣṭa* of the White Yajus.

¹⁷ Śikshā still continues to be the name of a species. A considerable number of treatises so entitled have recently been found, and more are constantly being brought to light. Cf. Kriehorn, *J. St.*, xiv. 160.

now specially designated by those titles. It is in Yáska's work, the *Nirukti*, that we find the first general notions of grammar. Starting from the phonetic rules, the observance of which the *Pratísákhyā-Sūtras* had already established with so much minuteness—but only for each of the *Veda-Saṃhitās*—advance was no doubt gradually made, in the first place, to a general view of the subject of phonetics, and thence to the remaining portions of the domain of language. Inflection, derivation, and composition were recognised and distinguished, and manifold reflections were made upon the modifications thereby occasioned in the meaning of the root. Yáska mentions a considerable number of grammatical teachers who preceded him, some by name individually, others generally under the name of *Nairuktas*, *Vaiyākaraṇas*, from which we may gather that a very brisk activity prevailed in this branch of study. To judge from a passage in the *Kaushītaki-Brāhmaṇa*, linguistic research must have been carried on with peculiar enthusiasm in the North of India; and accordingly, it is the northern, or rather the north-western district of India that gave birth to the grammarian who is to be looked upon as the father of Sanskrit grammar, Pāṇini. Now, if Yáska himself must be considered as belonging only to the last stages of the Vedic period, Pāṇini—from Yáska to whom is a great leap—must have lived at the very close of it, or even at the beginning of the next period. Advance from the simple designation of grammatical words by means of terms corresponding to them in sense, which we find in Yáska, to the algebraic symbols of Pāṇini, implies a great amount of study in the interval. Besides, Pāṇini himself presupposes some such symbols as already known; he cannot therefore be regarded as having invented, but only as having consistently carried out a method which is certainly in a most eminent degree suited to its purpose.

Lastly, Philosophical Speculation also had its peculiar development contemporaneously with, and subsequently to, the *Brāhmaṇas*. It is in this field and in that of grammar that the Indian mind attained the highest pitch of its marvellous fertility in subtle distinctions, however abstruse or naïve, on the other hand, the method may occasionally be.

of philosophers, the *Βραχμᾶνες* and the *Σαρμάναι*, yet we should hardly be justified in identifying the latter with the Buddhist mendicants, at least, not exclusively; for he expressly mentions the *ύλόβιοι*—i.e., the Brahmachárin and Vánaprasthas, the first and third of the stages into which a Brahman's life is distributed—as forming part of the *Σαρμάναι*. The distinction between the two sects probably consisted in this, that the *Βραχμᾶνες* were the “philosophers” by birth, also those who lived as householders (*Grihasthas*); the *Σαρμάναι*, on the contrary, those who gave themselves up to special mortifications, and who might belong also to other castes. The *Πράμναι*, mentioned by Strabo in another passage (see Lassen, *I. A.K.* i. 836), whom, following the accounts of Alexander's time, he describes as accomplished polemical dialecticians, in contradistinction to the *Βραχμᾶνες*, whom he represents as chiefly devoted to physiology and astronomy, appear either to be identical with the *Σαρμάναι*—a supposition favoured by the fact that precisely the same things are asserted of both—or else, with Lassen, they may be regarded as *Prámānas*, i.e., founding their belief on *pramáṇa*, logical proof, instead of revelation. As, however, the word is not known in the writings of that period, we should in this case hardly be justified in accepting Strabo's report as true of Alexander's time, but only of a later age. Philosophical systems are not to be spoken of in connection with this period; only isolated views and speculations are to be met with in those portions of the *Bráhmaṇas* here concerned, viz., the so-called Upanishads (*upanishad*, a session, a lecture). Although there prevails in these a very marked tendency to systematise and subdivide, the investigations still move within a very narrow and limited range. Considerable progress towards systematising, and expansion is visible in the Upanishads found in the *Áraṇyakas*,* i.e., writings supplementary to the *Bráhmaṇas*, and specially designed for the *ύλόβιοι*; and still greater progress in those Upanishads which stand by themselves, i.e.,

* The name *Áraṇyaka* occurs first in the *várttika* to Pán. iv. 2. 129 [see on this, *I. St.*, v. 49], then in Manu, iv. 123; Yájñavalkya, i. 145 (in both

passages in contradistinction to ‘Veda’), iii. 110, 309; and in the Atharvopanishads (see *I. St.*, ii. 179).

those which, although perhaps originally annexed to a *Brāhmaṇa* or an *Āraṇyaka* of one of the three older Vedas, have come down to us at the same time—or, it may be, have come down to us only—in an *Atharvan* recension. Finally, those *Upanishads* which are directly attached to the *Atharva-Veda* are complete vehicles of developed philosophical systems; they are to some extent sectarian in their contents, in which respect they reach down to the time of the *Purāṇas*. That, however, the fundamental works now extant of the philosophical systems, viz., their *Sūtras*, were composed much later than has hitherto been supposed, is conclusively proved by the following considerations. In the first place, the names of their authors are either not mentioned at all in the most modern *Brāhmaṇas* and *Āraṇyakas*, or, if they are, it is under a different form and in other relations—in such a way, however, that their later acceptance is already foreshadowed and exhibited in the germ. Secondly, the names of the sages mentioned in the more ancient of them are only in part identical with those mentioned in the latest liturgical *Sūtras*. And, thirdly, in all of them the *Veda* is expressly presupposed as a whole, and direct reference is also made to those *Upanishads* which we are warranted in recognising as the latest real *Upanishads*; nay, even to such as are only found attached to the *Atharvan*. The style, too, the enigmatical conciseness, the mass of technical terms—although these are not yet endowed with an algebraic force—imply a long previous period of special study to account for such precision and perfection. The philosophical *Sūtras*, as well as the grammatical *Sūtra*, should therefore be considered as dating from the beginning of the next period, within which both are recognised as of predominant authority.

In closing this survey of Vedic literature, I have lastly to call attention to two other branches of science, which, though they do not appear to have attained in this period to the possession of a literature—at least, not one of which direct relics and records have reached us—must yet have enjoyed considerable cultivation—I mean Astronomy and Medicine. Both received their first impulse from the exigencies of religious worship. Astronomical observations—though at first, of course, these were only of the

rudest description—were necessarily required for the regulation of the solemn sacrifices; in the first place, of those offered in the morning and evening, then of those at the new and full moon, and finally of those at the commencement of each of the three seasons. Anatomical observations, again, were certain to be brought about by the dissection of the victim at the sacrifice, and the dedication of its different parts to different deities. The Indo-Germanic mind, too, being so peculiarly susceptible to the influences of nature, and nature in India more than anywhere else inviting observation, particular attention could not fail to be early devoted to it. Thus we find in the later portions of the Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā and in the Chhândogyaopaniṣad express mention made of “observers of the stars” and “the science of astronomy;” and, in particular, the knowledge of the twenty-seven (twenty-eight) lunar mansions was early diffused. They are enumerated singly in the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā, and the order in which they there occur is one that must necessarily* have been established somewhere between 1472 and 536 B.C. Strabo, in the above-mentioned passage, expressly assigns *ἀστρονομία* as a favourite occupation of the *Βραχμᾶνες*. Nevertheless, they had not yet made great progress at this period; their observations were chiefly confined to the course of the moon, to the solstice, to a few fixed stars, and more particularly to astrology.

As regards Medicine, we find, especially in the Saṃhitā of the Atharvan, a number of songs addressed to illnesses and healing herbs, from which, however, there is not much to be gathered. Animal anatomy was evidently thoroughly understood, as each separate part had its own distinctive name. Alexander’s companions, too, extol the Indian physicians, especially for their treatment of snake-bite.

* See *I. St.*, ii. 240, note. [The correct numbers are rather 2780-1820 B.C., see *I. St.*, x. 234-236 (1866); 860, *ibid.* p. 236, ff. See further and for the *bharanī* series, which seems to be that contained in the Jyotisha, we obtain the years 1820-860, *ibid.* p. 236, ff. See further the remarks in note 2 above.]

From this preliminary survey of Vedic literature we now pass to the details. Adhering strictly to the Indian classification, we shall consider each of the four Vedas by itself, and deal with the writings belonging to them in their proper order, in connection with each Veda separately.

And first of the *Rigveda*. The *Rigveda-Samhitā* presents a twofold subdivision—the one purely external, having regard merely to the compass of the work, and evidently the more recent; the other more ancient, and based on internal grounds. The former distribution is that into eight *ashfakas* (eighths), nearly equal in length, each of which is again subdivided into as many *adhyāyas* (lectures), and each of these again into about 33 (2006 in all) *turgas* (sections), usually consisting of five verses.¹⁸ The latter is that into ten *maṇḍalas* (circles), 85 *anuvākas* (chapters), 1017 *sūktas* (hymns), and 10,580 *ṛichas* (verses); it rests on the variety of authors to whom the hymns are ascribed. Thus the first and tenth *maṇḍalas* contain songs by Rishis of different families; the second *maṇḍala*, on the contrary (*ashf.* ii. 71–113), contains songs belonging to Gṛtsamada; the third (*ashf.* ii. 114–119, iii. 1–56) belongs to Viśvāmitra; the fourth (*ashf.* iii. 57–114) to Vāmadeva; the fifth (*ashf.* iii. 115–122, iv. 1–79) to Atri; the sixth (*ashf.* iv. 80–140, v. 1–14) to Bharadvāja; the seventh (*ashf.* v. 15–118) to Vasishtha; the eighth (*ashf.* v. 119–129, vi. 1–81) to Kaṇva; and the ninth (*ashf.* vi. 82–124, vii. 1–71) to Aṅgiras.¹⁹ By the names of these Rishis we must understand not merely the individuals, but also their families. The hymns in each separate *maṇḍala* are arranged in the order of the deities addressed.²⁰ Those addressed to Agni occupy the first place, next come those

¹⁸ For particulars see *J. St.*, iii. 255; Müller, *Ant. S. Lit.*, p. 220.

¹⁹ The first *maṇḍala* contains 24 *anuvākas* and 191 *sūktas*; the second 4 *an.* 43 s.; the third 5 *an.* 62 s.; the fourth 5 *an.* 58 s.; the fifth 6 *an.* 57 s.; the sixth 6 *an.* 75 s.; the seventh 6 *an.* 104 s.; the eighth 10 *an.* 92 s. (*śuklas* 11 *sūktakhyā-*

sūktas); the ninth 7 *an.* 114 s.; and the tenth 12 *an.* 191 s.

²⁰ Delbrück, in his review of *Siebenzig Lieder des Rigveda* (cf. note 32) in the *Jenae Literaturzeitung* (1875, p. 867), points out that in books 2–7 the hymns to Agni and Indra are arranged in a descending gradation as regards the number of verses.

to Indra, and then those to other gods. This, at least, is the order in the first eight *maṇḍalas*. The ninth is addressed solely to Soma, and stands in the closest connection with the Sāma-Saṃhitā, one-third of which is borrowed from it; whereas the tenth *maṇḍala* stands in a very special relation to the Atharva-Saṃhitā. The earliest mention of this order of the *maṇḍalas* occurs in the Aitareya-Āraṇyaka, and in the two Grihya-Sūtras of Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana. The Prātiśākhya and Yāska recognise no other division, and therefore give to the Rik-Saṃhitā the name of *daśatayyas*, i.e., the songs "in ten divisions," a name also occurring in the Sāma-Sūtras. The Anukramaṇī of Kātyāyana, on the contrary, follows the division into *aṣṭakas* and *adhyāyas*. The name *sūkta*, as denoting hymn, appears for the first time in the second part of the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus; the Rik-Brāhmaṇas do not seem to be acquainted with it,²⁰ but we find it in the Aitareya-Āraṇyaka, &c. The extant recension of the Rik-Saṃhitā is that of the Śākalas, and belongs specially, it would seem, to that branch of this school which bears the name of the Śaiśirīyas. Of another recension, that of the Vāshkalas, we have but occasional notices, but the difference between the two does not seem to have been considerable. One main distinction, at all events, is that its eighth *maṇḍala* contains eight additional hymns, making 100 in all, and that, consequently, its sixth *aṣṭaka* consists of 132 hymns.²¹ The name of the Śākalas is evidently related to Śākalya, a sage often mentioned in the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, who is

²⁰ This is a mistake. They know the word not only in the above, but also in a technical sense, viz., as a designation of one of the six parts of the *śāstra* ('canon'), more especially of the main substance of it; when thus applied, *sūkta* appears in a collective meaning, comprising several *sūktas*. Cf. Śāṅkh. Brāhm., xiv. 1.

²¹ I am at present unable to corroborate this statement in detail. I can only show, from Śaunaka's Anuvākānukramaṇī, that the recension of the Vāshkalas had eight hymns more than that of the Śākalas, but not that these eight hymns

formed part of the eighth *maṇḍala*. When I wrote the above I was probably thinking of the Vālakhilyas, whose number is given by Sāyana, in his commentary on the Ait. Br., as eight (cf. Roth, *Zur Litt. und Gesch. des Weda*, p. 35; Haug on Ait. Br., 6. 24, p. 416), whereas the editions of Müller and Aufrecht have eleven. But as to whether these eight or eleven Vālakhilyas belong specially to the Vāshkalas, I cannot at present produce any direct evidence. On other differences of the Vāshkala school, &c., see Adalb. Kuhn, in *I. St.*, i. 108, ff.

stated by Yáska²² to be the author of the Padapátha* of the Rik-Samhitá† According to the accounts in the Bráhmaṇa of the White Yajus (the Śatapatha-Bráhmaṇa), a Śákalya, surnamed Vidagdha (the cunning?), lived contemporaneously with Yājñavalkya as a teacher at the court of Janaka, King of Videha, and that as the declared adversary and rival of Yājñavalkya. He was vanquished and cursed by the latter, his head dropped off, and his bones were stolen by robbers.—Várkali also (a local form of Váshkali) is the name of one of the teachers mentioned in the second part of the Śatapatha-Bráhmaṇa.²³

The Śákalas appear in tradition as intimately connected with the Śunakas, and to Śaunaka in particular a number of writings are attributed,‡ which he is said to have composed with a view to secure the preservation of the text (*rigvedagupṭhaye*), as, for instance, an Anukramanī of the Rishis, of the metres, of the deities, of the *anurákas*, of the hymns, an arrangement (? Vidhāna) of the verses and their constituent parts,²⁴ the above-mentioned Bṛihaddevatá,

²² Or rather Durga, in his comm. on Nir. iv. 4; see Roth, p. 39, introduction, p. lxxvi.

* This is the designation of that peculiar method of reciting the Veda in which each word of the text stands by itself, unmodified by the euphonic changes it has to undergo when connected with the preceding and following words. [See above, p. 23.]

† His name seems to point to

the name of the place where he lived.

has; see also Burnouf, *Introduction à l'Hist. du Buddh.*, p. 620, ff. The passage in the sūtra of Pāṇini, iv. 3. 12S, has no local reference [on the data from the Mahābhāṣya bearing on this point, see *J. St.*, xii. 360, 372, 409, 42S, 44S]. On the other hand, we find Śákya also in the Kosala country in Kapilavastu, of whom, however, as of the Śákalyana in the Yajus, we do not exactly know what to make (see below). [The earliest mention of the word Śákala, in immediate reference

to the Rik, occurs in a memorial verse, *yajñagāthā*, quoted in the Ait. Bráhm., iii. 43 (see *J. St.*, ix. 277).—For the name Śaśirīya I can only cite the *prarāra* section added at the close of the Āśvalāyana-Srauta-Sūtra, in which the Śaśirī are mentioned several times, partly by themselves, partly beside and in association with the Śungas.]

²³ This form of name, which might be traced to *vrkālā*, occurs also in the Śākhya Aranyaka, viii. 2. “*aśtīśaharā Várkalino bṛhatir aharathisampadayanti*,” though the parallel passage in the Aitar. Arany., iii. 8, otherwise similarly worded, reads instead of “*Várkalino*,” “*ai* (i.e., *rai*) *Arlalino*!”

‡ By Śaḍguraśūbha, in the introduction to his commentary on the Rik-Anukramanī of Kātyāyana.

²⁴ Rather two Vidhāna texts (see below), the one of which has for its object the application of particular *riśhas*, the other probably that of particular *paśhas*, to superstitious purposes, after the manner of the Śamavidhāna Bráhmaṇa.

and this was probably accomplished, in the case of both Ved

I
as I

This is most clearly shown by the mythological and geographical data contained in them.

The former, the mythological relations, represented in the older hymns of the Rik, in part carry us back to the primitive Indo-Germanic time. They contain relics of the childlike and naive conceptions then prevailing, such as may also be traced among the Teutons and Greeks. So, for instance, the idea of the change of the departed spirit into air, which is conducted by the winged wind, as by a faithful dog, to its place of destination, as is shown by the identity of Sárameya and 'Ερμείας,* of Śabala and Κέρβερος.† Further, the idea of the celestial sea, Varuna, Οὐρανός, encompassing the world; of the Father-Heaven, Dyaushpitar, Ζεύς, Diespiter; of the Mother-Earth, Δημήτηρ; of the waters of the sky as shining nymphs; of the sun's rays as cows at pasture; of the dark cloud-god as the robber who carries off these maidens and cows; and of the mighty god who wields the lightning and thunderbolt, and who chastises and strikes down the ravisher; and other such notions‡ Only the faintest outlines of

yet discernible; it will
claim and obtain, in
position exactly analogous to that which has already, in fact, been secured by comparative Indo-Germanic grammar in relation to classical grammar. The ground on which that mythology has hitherto stood trembles beneath it, and the new light about to be shed upon it we owe to the hymns of the Rigveda, which enable us to glance, as it were, into the workshop whence it originally proceeded §

* See Kuhn, in Haupt's *Deutsche Zeitschrift*, vi. 125, ff.

† *I. St.*, ii. 297, ff. [and, still earlier, Max Muller; see his *Chips from a German Workshop*, ii. 182].

‡ See Kuhn, *l. c.*, and repeatedly in the *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, edited by him jointly with Aufrecht (vol. i., 1851).

§ See *Z. D. M. G.*, v. 112. [Since I wrote the above, comparative mythology has been enriched with much valuable matter, but much also that is crude and fanciful has been advanced. Deserving of special mention, besides various papers by Adalb. Kuhn in his *Zeitschrift*, are two papers by the same author, entitled,

of the myth had become entirely obliterated. Indra is there but the quarrelsome and jealous god, who subdues the unwieldy giant by low cunning; and in the Indian epic the myth either still retains the same form, or else Indra is represented by a human hero, Arjuna, an incarnation of himself, who makes short work of the giant, and the kings who pass for the incarnations of the latter. The principal figures of the Mahá-Bhárata and Rámáyana fall away like the kings of Firdúsí, and there remain for history only those general events in the story of the people to which the ancient myths about the gods have been applied. The personages fade into the background, and in this representation are only recognisable as poetic creations.

Thirdly, the songs of the Rik unfold to us particulars as to the time, place, and conditions of their origin and growth. In the more ancient of them the Indian people appear to us settled on the banks of the Indus, divided into a number of small tribes, in a state of mutual hostility, leading a patriarchal life as husbandmen and nomads; living separately or in small communities, and represented by their kings, in the eyes of each other by the wars they wage, and in presence of the gods by the common sacrifices they perform. Each father of a family acts as priest in his own house, himself kindling the sacred fire, performing the domestic ceremonies, and offering up praise and prayer to the gods. Only for the great common sacrifices—a sort of tribe-festivals, celebrated by the king—are special priests appointed, who distinguish themselves by their comprehensive knowledge of the requisite rites and by their learning, and amongst whom a sort of rivalry is gradually developed, according as one tribe or another is considered to have more or less prospered by its sacrifices. Especially prominent here is the enmity between the families of Vaśishtha and Viśvámitra, which runs through all Vedic antiquity, continues to play an important part in the epic, and is kept up even to the latest times; so that, for example, a commentator of the Veda who claims to be descended from Vaśishtha leaves passages unexpounded in which the latter is stated to have had a curse imprecated upon him. This implacable hatred owes its origin to the trifling circumstance of Vaśishtha

what was its principal cause, is still uncertain. Was it the pressure brought about by the arrival of new settlers? Was it excess of population? Or was it only the longing for the beautiful tracts of Hindustán? Or perhaps all these causes combined? According to a legend preserved in the Bráhmaṇa of the White Yajus, the priests were in a great measure the cause of this movement, by urging it upon the kings, even against their will [*I. St.*, i. 178]. The connection with the ancestral home on the Indus remained, of course, at first a very close one; later on, however, when the new Brahmanical organisation was completely consolidated in Hindustán, a strong element of bitterness was infused into it, since the Brahmans looked upon their old kinsmen who had remained true to the customs of their forefathers as apostates and unbelievers.

But while the origin of the songs of the Rik dates from this primitive time, the redaction of the Rik-Samhitá only took place, as we observed, at a period when the Brahmanical hierarchy was fully developed, and when the Kosala-Videhas and Kuru-Pañchálas,* who are to be regarded as having been specially instrumental in effecting it, were in their prime. It is also certain that not a few of the songs were composed either at the time of the emigration into Hindustán, or at the time of the compilation itself. Such songs are to be found in the last book especially, a comparatively large portion of which, as I have already remarked, recurs in the Atharvaveda-Samhitá. It is for the critic to determine approximately in the case of each individual song, having regard to its con-

* *Manda'a* x. 98 is a dialogue between Devápi and Saptanu, the two 'Kauraryau,' as Yáska calls them. In the Mahá-Bhárata Saptanu is the name of the father of Bhishma and Vichitravírya, by whose two wives, Ambiká and Ambalíká, Vyása became the father of Dhritaráshtra and Páṇḍu. This Saptanu is, therefore, the grandfather of these latter, or the great-grandfather of the Kauravas and Páṇḍavas, the belligerents in the Mahá-Bhárata. We should thus have to suppose that the feud de-

scribed in this epic had been fought out long before the final arrangement of the Rik-Samhitá! It is, however, questionable whether the Saptanu of the Mahá-Bhárata is identical with the Saptanu mentioned in the Rik; or, even if we take this for granted, whether he may not merely have been associated with the epic legend in *majorem rei gloriam*. Devápi, at least, who, according to Yáska, is his brother, has in the Rik a different father from the one given in the epic. See *I. St.*, i. 203.

having once been appointed chief sacrificial priest instead of Viśvāmitra by one of the petty kings of these early times. The influence of these royal priests does not, however, in this early period, extend beyond the sacrifice; the king is still as yet; the people is still one united whole. The name, that of *viśas*, settlers, probably elected, is called Viśpati, a Vedic name. The free position held by him is remarkable. We find songs of praise attributed to poetesses and queens, and Atri appears in the foremost rank. The element is not the same as that of the stamp of the king, is, however, the same. The rulers of the Vedic period, united prayer. The recognition of the beings of the same time is dependent on the same. It is established that the want of gods is as great as the need of and I will not be right on the point of no grace. The religiousness, a picture of which we are now endeavouring to gradually bring to degrees of civilization, and it is what it is that the masses of the Ganges,

rest of the

the Kāṭhān,

the Tāṭh.

what was its principal cause, is still uncertain. Was it the pressure brought about by the arrival of new settlers? Was it excess of population? Or was it only the longing for the beautiful tracts of Hindustán? Or perhaps all these causes combined? According to a legend preserved in the Bráhmaṇa of the White Yajus, the priests were in a great measure the cause of this movement, by urging it upon the kings, even against their will [*J. St.*, i. 178]. The connection with the ancestral home on the Indus remained, of course, at first a very close one, later on, however, when the new Brahmanical organisation was completely consolidated in Hindustán, a strong element of bitterness was infused into it, since the Brahmans looked upon their old kinsmen who had remained true to the customs of their forefathers as apostates and unbelievers.

But while the origin of the songs of the Rik dates from this primitive time, the redaction of the Rik-Samhitá only took place, as we observed, at a period when the Brahmanical hierarchy was fully developed, and when the Kosala-Videhas and Kuru-Pañchálas,* who are to be regarded as having been specially instrumental in effecting it, were in their prime. It is also certain that not a few of the songs were composed either at the time of the emigration into Hindustán, or at the time of the compilation itself. Such songs are to be found in the last book especially, a comparatively large portion of which, as I have already remarked, recurs in the Atharvaveda-Samhitá. It is for the critic to determine approximately in the case of each individual song, having regard to its con-

* *Maṇḍa'a* x. 98 is a dialogue between Devápi and Śamṭanu, the two 'Kauravyau,' as Yáska calls them. In the Mahá-Bhárata Śamṭanu is the name of the father of Bhishma and Vichitravírya, by whose two wives, Ambiká and Ambalíká, Vyása became the father of Dhítarashtra and Pándu. This Śamṭanu is, therefore, the grandfather of these latter, or the great-grandfather of the Kauravas and Pándavas, the belligerents in the Mahá-Bhárata. We should thus have to suppose that the feud de-

scribed in this epic had been fought out long before the final arrangement of the Rik-Samhitá! It is, however, questionable whether the Śamṭanu of the Mahá-Bhárata is identical with the Śamṭanu mentioned in the Rik; or, even if we take this for granted, whether he may not merely have been associated with the epic legend in *maioris rei gloriam*. Devápi, at least, who, according to Yáska, is his brother, has in the Rik a different father from the one given in the epic. See *J. St.*, i. 203.

the groundwork and the outlines of this ancient edifice.²⁹ Besides the powers of nature, we find, as development progresses, personifications also of spiritual conceptions, of ethical import; but the adoration of these, as compared with the former, is of later origin.

I have already discussed the precautions taken to secure the text of the Rik-Samhitá, *i.e.*, the question of its authenticity, and I have likewise alluded to the aids to its explanation furnished by the remaining Vedic literature. These latter reduce themselves chiefly to the Nighantus, and the Nirukta of Yáska.³⁰ Both works, in their turn, found their commentators in course of time. For the Nighantus, we have the commentary of Devarájayavan, who belongs to about the fifteenth or sixteenth century. In the introduction he enlarges upon the history of their study, from which they appear to have found only one other complete commentator since Yáska, *viz.*, Skandasvámin. For Yáska's Nirukta a commentary has been handed down to us dating from about the thirteenth century, that of Durga. Both works, moreover, the Nighantus as well as the Nirukta, exist in two different recensions. These do not materially differ from one another, and chiefly in respect of arrangement only, but the very fact of their existence leads us to suppose that these works were originally transmitted orally rather than in writing. A commentary, properly so called, on the Rik-Samhitá, has come down to us, but it dates only from the fourteenth century, that of Sáyanáchárya.* "From the long series of

²⁹ Muir's *Original Sanskrit Texts*, vol. v. (1870), is the best source of information for Vedic mythology.

³⁰ This name appears both in the *Vaśīṣṭa* in the last book of the *Śatap Br.*, and in the *Kāndīnukrama* of the *Ātreya* school, where he is called *Pañṣi*, and described as the pupil of *Vaiśampāyana*, and teacher of *Tittiri*. From *Pāṇi*, ii. 4. 63, it

again is quoted by *Pāṇini*; see *I. St.*, iii. 475. A direct reference to Yáska is made in the *Rik-Prāt.* and in the *Bṛihaddevatā*; see also *I. St.*, viii. 96, 245, 246.

* The circumstance that commentaries on almost all branches of the Vedas, and on various other important and extensive works as well, are ascribed to Sáyana and his brother Mádhaba, is to be explained by the practice prevailing in India by which works composed by order of some distinguished person bear his name as the author. So in the present day the Pandits work for the person who pays them, and leave

the groundwork and the outlines of this ancient edifice.²⁹ Besides the powers of nature, we find, as development progresses, personifications also of spiritual conceptions, of ethical import; but the adoration of these, as compared with the former, is of later origin.

I have already discussed the precautions taken to secure the text of the Rik-Samhitá, *i.e.*, the question of its authenticity, and I have likewise alluded to the aids to its explanation furnished by the remaining Vedic literature. These latter reduce themselves chiefly to the Nighantus, and the Nirukta of Yáska.³⁰ Both works, in their turn, found their commentators in course of time. For the Nighantus, we have the commentary of Devarájayajvan, who belongs to about the fifteenth or sixteenth century. In the introduction he enlarges upon the history of their study, from which they appear to have found only one other complete commentator since Yáska, viz., Skandasvámin. For Yáska's Nirukta a commentary has been handed down to us dating from about the thirteenth century, that of Durga. Both works, moreover, the Nighantus as well as the Nirukta, exist in two different recensions. These do not materially differ from one another, and chiefly in respect of arrangement only; but the very fact of their existence leads us to suppose that these works were originally transmitted orally rather than in writing. A commentary, properly so called, on the Rik-Samhitá, has come down to us, but it dates only from the fourteenth century, that of Sáyanácharya.* "From the long series of

²⁹ Muir's *Original Sanskrit Texts*, vol. v. (1870), is the best source of

again is quoted by Pánini; see *I. St.*, iii. 475. A direct reference to Yáska is made in the Rik-Prát. and in the Brhaddevatí; see also *I. St.*, viii. 96, 245, 246.

Tattiri. From *Páṇi*, ii. 4. 63, it follows that Pánini was cognisant of

* The circumstance that commentaries on almost all branches of the Vedas, and on various other important and extensive works as well, are ascribed to Sáyaṇa and his brother Mádhava, is to be explained by the practice prevailing in India by which works composed by order of some distinguished person bear his name as the author. So in the present day the Pandits work for the person who pays them, and leave

mentioned in the Káṭhaka, which

centuries* between Yáska and Sáyana but scanty remains of an exegetic literature connected with the Rik-Samhitá are left to us, or, at any rate, have as yet been discovered. Śaṃkara and the Vedāntic school turned their attention chiefly to the Upanishads. Nevertheless, a gloss upon a portion at least of the Rik-Samhitá was drawn up by Ānandatīrtha, a pupil of Śaṃkara, of which there is an exposition by Jayatīrtha, comprising the second and third *adhyāyas* of the first *aṣṭaka*, in the Library of the India House in London." Sáyana himself, in addition to Durga's commentary on the Nirukti, only quotes Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Miśra and Bharatasvāmin as expositors of the Vedas.³¹ The former wrote a commentary upon the Taitt. Yajus, not the Rik-Samhitá, in which he refers to Kāsakritsna, Ekachūrṇi, and Yáska as his predecessors in the work. For Bharatasvāmin we have no further data than that his name is also cited by Devarāja (on the Nighaṇṭus), who further mentions Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Miśra, Mādhavadeva, Bhavasvāmin, Guhadēva, Śrīnivāsa, and Uvaṭṭa. The latter, otherwise called Ūṭa, wrote a commentary on the

the fruit of their labour to him as his property. Mādhava, and probably also Sáyana, were ministers at the court of King Bukka at Vijayanagara, and took advantage of their position to give a fresh impulse to the study of the Veda. The writings attributed to them point, by the very difference of their contents and style, to a variety of authorship. [According to A. C. Burnell, in the preface to his edition of the *Vanśa-Brāhmaṇa*, p. viii., ff. (1873), the two names denote one person only. Sáyana, he says, is "the Bhoga-nātha, or mortal body, of Mādhava, the soul identified with Viṣṇu." Burnell is further of opinion that the twenty-nine writings current under the name of Mādhava all proceed from Mādhava himself, unassisted to any large extent by others, and that they were composed by him during a period of about thirty of the fifty-five years between 1331-1386 A.D., which he spent as abbot of the monastery at Śrīṅgeri, under

the name Vidyāraṇyasvāmin. See my remarks to the contrary in *Literarisches Centralblatt* (1873), p. 1421. Burnell prefers the form Vidyānagara to Vijayanagara. Cowell, in his note on Colebr., *Misc. Ess.*, i. 235, has Vidyā° and Vijaya° side by side.]

* See Roth, *Zur Litt.*, p. 22.

³¹ To these have to be added Skandasvāmin (see p. 41) and Karpardin (see below); and as anterior to Sáyana we must probably regard the works of Ātmānanda, Rāvaṇa, and Kauśika (or is the latter identical with Bhaṭṭa Kauśika Bhāskara Miśra? cf. Burnell, *Catalogue of Vedic MSS.*, p. 12), and the *Gūḍhārtharatnamālā*; Burnell, *Vanśabr.*, p. xxvi., ff.; Müller, in the preface to his large edition of the Rik-Samhitá, vol. vi. p. xxvii., ff. Some extracts from Rāvaṇa's commentary have been published by Fitz-Edward Hall in *Journal As. Soc. Beng.*, 1862, pp. 129-134.

Samhitá of the White Yajus, not the Rik-Samhitá, as well as commentaries on the two Prátisákhyas of the Rik and the White Yajus.

As regards European researches, the Rik-Samhitá, as well as the other Vedas, first became known to us through Colebrooke's excellent paper "On the Vedas," in the *As. Res.* vol. viii. (Calc. 1805). To Rosen we are indebted for the first text, as given partly in his *Rigvedæ Specimen* (London, 1830), partly in the edition of the first *ashṭaka*, with Latin translation, which only appeared after the early death of the lamented author (*ibid* 1838). Since then, some other smaller portions of the text of the Rik-Samhitá have here and there been communicated to us in text or translation, especially in Roth's already often quoted and excellent *Abhandlungen zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Weda* (Stuttgart, 1846). The entire Samhitá, together with the commentary of Sáyana, is now being published, edited by Dr. M. Muller of Oxford, at the expense of the East India Company; the first *ashṭaka* appeared in 1849. At the same time an edition of the text, with extracts from the commentary, is in course of publication in India. From Dr. M. Muller, too, we may expect detailed prolegomena to his edition, which are to treat in particular of the position held by the songs of the Rik in the history of civilisation. A French translation by Langlois comprises the entire Samhitá (1848-1851); it is, of course, in many respects highly useful, although in using it great caution is necessary. An English translation by Wilson is also begun, of which the first *ashṭaka* only has as yet appeared.³²

³² Muller's edition of the text, together with the commentary of Sáyana, a complete index of words, and list of *pratikas*, is now complete, in six vols., 1849-1875. He has also published separately the text of the first *mandala*, in *samhitá* and *pada-páṭha* (Leipzig, 1856-69), as also the whole 10 *mandalas*, likewise in double form (London,

Indica, Nos. 1-4 (Calc. 1849), only reaches to the end of the second *adhyáya*. A fragment of the text, edited by Stevenson so long ago as 1833, extends but a little farther (i. 1-35).—Of Wilson's translation, five volumes have appeared; the last, in 1866, under the editorship of Cowell, brings it up to *mand.* viii. 20. Benfey published in his

We now turn to the *Brāhmaṇas* of the Rik.

Of these, we have two, the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa* and the *Śāṅkhāyana-* (or *Kaushītaki-*) *Brāhmaṇa*. They are closely connected with one another,* treat essentially of the same matter, not unfrequently, however, taking opposite views of the same question. It is in the distribution of their matter that they chiefly differ. In the *Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa* we have a perfectly arranged work, embracing on a definite plan the entire sacrificial procedure; but this does not seem to be the case in an equal degree in the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa*. The latter, moreover, appears to treat exclusively of the Soma sacrifice; whereas in the former it merely occupies the principal place. In the *Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa* we meet with nothing at all corresponding to the last ten *adhyāyas* of the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa*, a gap which is only filled up by the *Śāṅkhāyana-Sūtra*; and for this reason, as well as from internal evidence, it may perhaps be assumed that the *adhyāyas* in question are but a later addition to the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa*. In the extant text, the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa* contains 40 *adhyāyas* (divided into eight *pañchikās*, or pen-

lated and explained (London, 1869). But the scholar who has done most by far for the right understanding of the Rik is Roth; both in the commentary added to his edition of Yāska's *Nirukta* (Göttingen, 1848-52), and in the great *St. Petersburg Sanskrit Dictionary* (seven vols., 1853-75), edited by Böhtlingk and him. Here we may also mention the following works:—Grassmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rigveda* (1873, ff.); Delbrück, *Das altindische Verbum* (1874); Benfey, *Einleitung in die Grammatik der vedischen Sprache* (1874), and *Die Quantitätsverschiedenheiten in den Samhitā- und Padī-Texten der Veden*; Bollensen, *Die Lieder des Parāśara*, in *Z. D. M. G.* xxii. (1868); *Siebenzig Lieder des Rigveda*, übersetzt von Karl Geldner und Adolf Kaegi, mit Beiträgen von R. Roth (Tübingen, 1875)—reviewed by Abel Bergaigne in the *Revue Critique*, Dec. 11 and 18, 1875; Alfred Ludwig, *Die Nachrichten d*

Rig- und Atharvaveda über Geographie, Geschichte und Verfassung des alten Indiens (the identification here mentioned, p. 13, of the Vedic Sarasvatī with the Indus, was first made by myself; cf. *Vāj. S. Spec.*, ii. 80 n., 1847), and *Die philosophischen und religiösen Anschauungen des Veda* (Prag, 1875); Alfred Hillebrandt, *Ueber die Göttin Aditi* (Breslau, 1876); H. Zimmer, *Parjanya Fiörgyn Vāta Vodan in Zeitschrift für Deutsches Alterthum*. New Series, vii. 164, ff. Lastly, we have to draw attention specially to Muir's *Original Sanskrit Texts* (5 vols., second edit., London, 1868, ff.), in which the antiquarian information contained in the Rik-Samhitā on the different stages and phases of Indian life at that early period is clearly and comprehensively grouped: translations of the most important Vedic passages and

is I. S. 89, ff.

tads), while the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa contains 30; and it is perhaps allowable to refer to them the rule in Pāṇini v. 1. 62, which states how the name of a Brāhmaṇa is to be formed if it contain 30 or 40 *adhyāyas*,—a view which would afford external warrant also of the fact of their existence in this form in Pāṇini's time, at all events. Geographical or similar data, from which a conclusion might be drawn as to the time of their composition, are of very rare occurrence. Most of these, together with really historical statements, are to be found in the last books of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa (see *I. St.*, i 199, ff.), from which it at any rate specially follows that their scene is the country of the Kuru-Pañchālas and Vāsa-Uśīnaras (see viii. 14). In the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa mention is made of a great sacrifice in the Naimisha forest; but this can hardly be identified with the one at which, according to the accounts of the Mahā-Bhārata, the second recitation of this epic took place. Another passage implies a very special prominence amongst the other gods of the deity who is afterwards known to us exclusively by the name of Śiva. He here receives, among other titles, those of Íśāna and Mahādeva, and we might perhaps venture to conclude from this that he was already the object of a very special worship. We are at any rate justified in inferring, unless the passage is an interpolation, that the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa ranks chronologically with the last books of the Samhitā of the White Yajus, and with those portions of its Brāhmaṇa and of the Atharva-Samhitā in which this nomenclature is likewise found. Lastly, a third passage of the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa implies, as already hinted, a special cultivation of the field of language in the northern parts of India. People resorted thither in order to become acquainted with the language, and on their return enjoyed a special authority on questions connected with it. [*I. St.*, ii. 309]

Both Brāhmaṇas presuppose literary compositions of some extent as having preceded them. Thus mention is made of the *ākhyānavidas*, i.e., "those versed in tradition;" and *gāthās*, *abhiyajna-gāthās*, a sort of memorial verses (*Chārikās*) are also frequently referred to and quoted. The

We now turn to the *Brāhmaṇas* of the Rik.

Of these, we have two, the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa* and the *Śāṅkhāyana-* (or *Kaushītaki-*) *Brāhmaṇa*. They are closely connected with one another,* treat essentially of the same matter, not unfrequently, however, taking opposite views of the same question. It is in the distribution of their matter that they chiefly differ. In the *Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa* we have a perfectly arranged work, embracing on a definite plan the entire sacrificial procedure; but this does not seem to be the case in an equal degree in the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa*. The latter, moreover, appears to treat exclusively of the Soma sacrifice; whereas in the former it merely occupies the principal place. In the *Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa* we meet with nothing at all corresponding to the last ten *adhyāyas* of the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa*, a gap which is only filled up by the *Śāṅkhāyana-Sūtra*; and for this reason, as well as from internal evidence, it may perhaps be assumed that the *adhyāyas* in question are but a later addition to the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa*. In the extant text, the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa* contains 40 *adhyāyas* (divided into eight *pañchikās*, or pen-

lated and explained (London, 1869). But the scholar who has done most by far for the right understanding of the Rik is Roth; both in the commentary added to his edition of Yāska's *Nirukta* (Göttingen, 1848-52), and in the great *St. Petersburg Sanskrit Dictionary* (seven vols., 1853-75), edited by Böhtlingk and him. Here we may also mention the following works:—Grassmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rigveda* (1873, ff.); Delbrück, *Das altindische Verbum* (1874); Benfey, *Einleitung in die Grammatik der vedischen Sprache* (1874), and *Die Quantitätsverschiedenheiten in den Samhitā- und Padī-Texten der Veden*; Bollensen, *Die Lieder des Parāśara*, in *Z. D. M. G.* xxii. (1868); Siebenzig *Lieder des Rigveda*, übersetzt von Karl Geldner und Adolf Kaegi, mit Beiträgen von R. Roth (Tübingen, 1875)—reviewed by Abel Bergaigne in the *Revue Critique*, Dec. 11 and 18, 1875; Alfred Ludwig, *Die Nachrichten des*

Rig- und Atharvaveda über Geographie, Geschichte und Verfassung des alten Indiens (the identification here mentioned, p. 13, of the Vedic Sarasvatī with the Indus, was first made by myself; cf. *Vāj. S. Spec.*, ii. 80 n., 1847), and *Die philosophischen und religiösen Anschauungen des Veda* (Prag, 1875); Alfred Hillebrandt, *Ueber die Göttin Aditi* (Breslau, 1876); H. Zimmer, *Parjanya Fiörgyn Vāta Wodan in Zeitschrift für Deutsches Alterthum*, New Series, vii. 164, ff. Lastly, we have to draw attention specially to Muir's *Original Sanskrit Texts* (5 vols., second edit., London, 1868, ff.), in which the antiquarian information contained in the Rik-Samhitā on the different stages and phases of Indian life at that early period is clearly and comprehensively grouped: translations of numerous Vedic passages and pieces are given.

* See on this *I. St.*, ii. 289, ff. [and ix. 377].

tads), while the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa contains 30; and it is perhaps allowable to refer to them the rule in Pāṇini v. 1. 62, which states how the name of a Brāhmaṇa is to be formed if it contain 30 or 40 *adhyāyas*,—a view which would afford external warrant also of the fact of their existence in this form in Pāṇini's time, at all events. Geographical or similar data, from which a conclusion might be drawn as to the time of their composition, are of very rare occurrence. Most of these, together with really historical statements, are to be found in the last books of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa (see *I. St.*, i. 199, ff.), from which it at any rate specially follows that their scene is the country of the Kuru-Pañchālas and Vāsa-Uśīnaras (see viii. 14). In the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa mention is made of a great sacrifice in the Naimisha forest; but this can hardly be identified with the one at which, according to the accounts of the Mahā-Bhārata, the second recitation of this epic took place. Another passage implies a very special prominence amongst the other gods of the deity who is afterwards known to us exclusively by the name of Śiva. He here receives, among other titles, those of Īśāna and Mahādeva, and we might perhaps venture to conclude from this that he was already the object of a very special worship. We are at any rate justified in inferring, unless the passage is an interpolation, that the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa ranks chronologically with the last books of the Saṃhitā of the White Yajus, and with those portions of its Brāhmaṇa and of the Atharva-Saṃhitā in which this nomenclature is likewise found. Lastly, a third passage of the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa implies, as already hinted, a special cultivation of the field of language in the northern parts of India. People resorted thither in order to become acquainted with the language, and on their return enjoyed a special authority on questions connected with it. [*I. St.*, ii. 309.]

Both Brāhmanas presuppose literary compositions of some extent as having preceded them. Thus mention is made of the *ākhyānavidas*, i.e., "those versed in tradition;" and *gāthās*, *abhiyajna-gāthās*, a sort of memorial verses (*kārikās*), are also frequently referred to and quoted. The names Rigveda, Sāmaveda, and Yajurveda, as well as *trayī vidyā*, a term used to express them collectively, repeatedly

occur. In the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa, however, special regard is had to the Paiṅgya and Kaushītaka, whose views are very frequently quoted side by side, that of the Kaushītaka being always recognised as final. The question now arises what we are to understand by these expressions, whether works of the Brāhmaṇa order already extant in a written form, or still handed down orally only—or merely the inherited tradition of individual doctrines. Mention of the Kaushītaka and the Paiṅgya occurs in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa only in a single passage—and that perhaps an interpolated one—in the latter part of the work. This at all events proves, what already seemed probable from its more methodical arrangement, that the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa is to be considered a later production than the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, since it appears to be a recast of two sets of views of similar tenor already extant under distinct names, while the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa presents itself as a more independent effort. The name Paiṅgya belongs to one of the sages mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus and elsewhere, from whose family Yāska Paiṅgi* was descended, and probably also Piṅgala, the author of a treatise on metre. The *Paiṅgi Kalpah* is expressly included by the commentator of Pāṇini, probably following the Mahābhāshya, among the ancient Kalpa-Sūtras, in contradistinction to the *Āsmārathah Kalpah*, with which we shall presently become acquainted as an authority of the Āśvalāyana-Sūtra. The Paiṅgins are, besides, frequently mentioned in early writings, and a Paiṅgi-Brāhmaṇa must still have been in existence even in Sāyaṇa's time, for he repeatedly refers to it. The case stands similarly as regards the name Kaushītaka, which, is, moreover, used directly in the majority of passages where it is quoted for the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa itself—a fact easy of explanation, as in the latter the view represented by the Kaushītaka is invariably upheld as the authoritative one, and we have in this Brāhmaṇa but a remoulding by Śāṅkhāyana of the stock of dogma peculiarly the property of the Kaushītakins. Further, in its commentary, which, it may be remarked,

* The quotations from Brāhmaṇas *Paiṅgi Kalpah* in the Mahābhāshya, in Yāska, therefore, belong in part see *I. St.*, xiii. 455.] perhaps to the Paiṅgya (?). [On the

interprets the work under the sole title of the "Kaushítaki-Bráhmaṇa," passages are frequently quoted from a Mahá-Kaushítaki-Bráhmaṇa, so that we have to infer the existence of a still larger work of similar contents,—probably a later handling of the same subject (?) This commentary further connects the Kaushítaki-Bráhmaṇa with the school of the Kauthumas—a school which otherwise belongs only to the Sámaveda: this, however, is a relation which has not as yet been cleared up.—The name Śáṅkháyana-Bráhmaṇa interchanges occasionally with the form Śáṅkhyáyana-Bráhmaṇa, but the former would seem to deserve the preference; its earliest occurrence is probably in the Prátiśákhyas-Sútra of the Black Yajus

The great number of myths and legends contained in both these Bráhmaṇas of the Rik invests them with a peculiar interest. These are not indeed introduced for their own sake, but merely with a view to explain the origin of some hymn; but this, of course, does not detract from their value. One of them, the legend of Śunahśepa, which is found in the second part of the Aitareya-Bráhmaṇa, is translated by Roth in the *Indische Studien*, i. 458-464, and discussed in detail, *ibid.*, ii. 112-123. According to him, it follows a more ancient metrical version. We must indeed assume generally, with regard to many of these legends, that they had already gained a rounded, independent shape in tradition before they were incorporated into the Bráhmaṇa, and of this we have frequent evidence in the distinctly archaic character of their language, compared with that of the rest of the text. Now these legends possess great value for us from two points of view: first, because they contain, to some extent at least, directly or indirectly, historical data, often stated in a plain and artless manner, but at other times disguised and only perceptible to the eye of criticism; and, secondly, because they present connecting links with the legends of later times, the origin of which would otherwise have remained almost entirely obscure

On the Aitareya-Bráhmaṇa we have a commentary by Sáyana, and on the Kaushítaki-Bráhmaṇa one by Vináyaka, a son of Mádhava.³³

³³ The Aitareya-Bráhmaṇa has been edited, text with translation, by Martin Haug, 2 vols., Bombay, 1863, see *I St.*, ix. 177-380 (1865).

To each of these Bráhmaṇas is also annexed an Áraṇyaka, or 'forest-portion,' that is, the portion to be studied in the forest by the sages known to us through Megasthenes as *ἰλόβιοι*, and also by their disciples. This forest-life is evidently only a later stage of development in Brahmanical contemplation, and it is to it that we must chiefly ascribe the depth of speculation, the complete absorption in mystic devotion by which the Hindús are so eminently distinguished. Accordingly, the writings directly designated as Áraṇyakas bear this character impressed upon them in a very marked degree; they consist in great part of Upanishads only, in which, generally speaking, a bold and vigorous faculty of thought cannot fail to be recognised, however much of the bizarre they may at the same time contain.

The *Aitareya-Áraṇyaka* ^{33b} consists of five books, each of which again is called Áraṇyaka. The second and third books* form a separate Upanishad; and a still further subdivision here takes place, inasmuch as the four last sections of the second book, which are particularly consonant with the doctrines of the Vedānta system, pass *κατ' ἐξοχήν* as the *Aitareyopanishad*.³⁴ Of these two books Mahidāsa Aitareya is the reputed author; he is supposed to be the son of Viśála and Itará, and from the latter his name Aitareya is derived. This name is indeed several times quoted in the course of the work itself as a final authority, a circumstance which conclusively proves the correctness of tracing to him the views therein propounded. For we must divest ourselves of the notion that a teacher of this period ever put his ideas into writing; oral delivery was his only method of imparting them to his pupils; the knowledge of them was transmitted by tradition, until it became fixed in

The legend of Śunaḥśepa (vii. 13-18), had been discussed by Roth; see also M. Müller, *Hist. of A. S. L.*, p. 73, ff. Another section of it (viii. 20), treating of royal inaugurations, had previously been edited by Schönborn (Berlin, 1862).
^{33b} The first fasciculus of an edition, together with Śáyaṇa's commentary, of the *Aitareya-Áraṇyaka*, Rājendra Lála Mitra, has just

come to hand (Nov. 30, 1875), see *Bibliotheca Indica*, New Series, No. 325; the text reaches as far as i. 4. 1.

* See *I. St.*, i. 388, ff.

³⁴ This *Aitareyopanishad*, amongst others, has been edited (with Śamkara's commentary) and translated by Roer, *Bibl. Ind.*, vii. 143, ff. (Calc. 1850), xv. 28, ff. (1853).

some definite form or other, always however retaining his name. It is in this way that we have to account for the fact of our finding the authors of works that have been handed down to us, mentioned in these works themselves. For the rest, the doctrines of Aitareya must have found especial favour, and his pupils have been especially numerous; for we find his name attached to the Bráhmaṇa as well as the Áraṇyaka. With respect to the former, however, no reasons can for the present be assigned, while for the fourth book of the Áraṇyaka we have the direct information that it belongs to Áśvaláyana,* the pupil of Śaunaka; nay, this Śaunaka himself appears to have passed for the author of the fifth book, according to Colebrooke's statements on the subject, *Misc. Ess.*, i. 47, n. The name of Aitareya is not traceable anywhere in the Bráhmaṇas, he is first mentioned in the Chhándogyopanishad. The earliest allusion to the school of the Aitareyas is in the Sāma-Sútras.—To judge from the repeated mention of them in the third book, the family of the Mandúkas, or Mándúkeyas, must also have been particularly active in the development of the views there represented. Indeed, we find them specified later as one of the five schools of the Rígveda; yet nothing bearing their name has been preserved except an extremely abstruse Upanishad, and the Mándúki-Śikshá, a grammatical treatise. The former, however, apparently only belongs to the Atharvan, and exhibits completely the standpoint of a rigid system. The latter might possibly be traced back to the Mándúkeya who is named here as well as in the Rik-Prátisákhyā.

The contents of the Aitareya-Áraṇyaka, as we now have it,³⁵ supply no direct clue to the time of its composi-

* I find an Áśvaláyana-Bráhmaṇa also quoted, but am unable to give any particulars regarding it. [In a MS of the Ait. Ar., India Office Library, 986, the entire work is described at the end as *Áśvaláyanoktam Áraṇyakam*.]

³⁵ See *I. St.*, i. 387-392. I am now in possession of the complete text, but have nothing material to add to the above remarks. Great stress is laid upon keeping the particular doctrines secret, and upon

the high importance of those familiar with them. Among the names mentioned in the course of the work, Agniveśyáṇa is of significance on account of its formation. The interesting passages on the three *páthas* of the Veda, *nirbhūja* = *samhitá-pátha*, *pratirūpa* = *padá-pátha*, and *ubhayamantarena* = *kramá-pátha*, are discussed by M. Muller on Rik-Prát, i. 2-4 (see also *ibid.*, *Nachtrage*, p. 11).

To each of these Bráhmaṇas is also annexed an Āraṇyaka, or 'forest-portion,' that is, the portion to be studied in the forest by the sages known to us through Megasthenes as *υλόβιοι*, and also by their disciples. This forest-life is evidently only a later stage of development in Brahmanical contemplation, and it is to it that we must chiefly ascribe the depth of speculation, the complete absorption in mystic devotion by which the Hindús are so eminently distinguished. Accordingly, the writings directly designated as Āraṇyakas bear this character impressed upon them in a very marked degree; they consist in great part of Upanishads only, in which, generally speaking, a bold and vigorous faculty of thought cannot fail to be recognised, however much of the bizarre they may at the same time contain.

The *Aitareya-Āraṇyaka*³³ consists of five books, each of which again is called Āraṇyaka. The second and third books* form a separate Upanishad; and a still further subdivision here takes place, inasmuch as the four last sections of the second book, which are particularly consonant with the doctrines of the Vedānta system, pass *κατ' ἐξοχὴν* as the *Aitareyopanishad*.³⁴ Of these two books Mahidāsa Aitareya is the reputed author; he is supposed to be the son of Viśāla and Itarī, and from the latter his name Aitareya is derived. This name is indeed several times quoted in the course of the work itself as a final authority, a circumstance which conclusively proves the correctness of tracing to him the views therein propounded. For we must divest ourselves of the notion that a teacher of this period ever put his ideas into writing; oral delivery was his only method of imparting them to his pupils; the knowledge of them was transmitted by tradition, until it became fixed in

The legend of Śunahśepa (vii. 13-18), had been discussed by Roth; see also M. Müller, *Hist. of A. S. L.*, p. 573, ff. Another section of it (viii. 5-20), treating of royal inaugurations, had previously been edited by Schönborn (Berlin, 1862).

^{33b} The first fasciculus of an edition, together with Śaṃyana's commentary, of the Aitareya-Āraṇyaka, by Rājendra Lāla Mitra, has just

come to hand (Nov. 30, 1875), see *Bibliotheca Indica*, New Series, No. 325; the text reaches as far as i. 4. 1.

* See *I. St.*, i. 388, ff.

³⁴ This Aitareyopanishad, amongst others, has been edited (with Śaṃkara's commentary) and translated by Roer, *Bibl. Ind.*, vii. 143, ff. (Calc. 1850), xv. 28, ff. (1853).

some definite form or other, always however retaining his name. It is in this way that we have to account for the fact of our finding the authors of works that have been handed down to us, mentioned in these works themselves. For the rest, the doctrines of Aitareya must have found especial favour, and his pupils have been especially numerous; for we find his name attached to the Bráhmaṇa as well as the Áraṇyaka. With respect to the former, however, no reasons can for the present be assigned, while for the fourth book of the Áraṇyaka we have the direct information that it belongs to Áśvaláyana,* the pupil of Śaunaka; nay, this Śaunaka himself appears to have passed for the author of the fifth book, according to Colebrooke's statements on the subject, *Misc. Ess.*, i. 47, n. The name of Aitareya is not traceable anywhere in the Bráhmaṇas; he is first mentioned in the Chhándogyopanishad. The earliest allusion to the school of the Aitareyas is in the Sáma-Sútras.—To judge from the repeated mention of them in the third book, the family of the Maṇḍúkas, or Maṇḍúkeyas, must also have been particularly active in the development of the views there represented. Indeed, we find them specified later as one of the five schools of the Rígveda; yet nothing bearing their name has been preserved except an extremely abstruse Upanishad, and the Maṇḍúkí-Śikshá, a grammatical treatise. The former, however, apparently only belongs to the Atharvan, and exhibits completely the standpoint of a rigid system. The latter might possibly be traced back to the Maṇḍúkeya who is named here as well as in the Rik-Prátisákhyá.

The contents of the Aitareya-Áraṇyaka, as we now have it,³⁵ supply no direct clue to the time of its composi-

* I find an Áśvaláyana-Bráhmaṇa also quoted, but am unable to give any particulars regarding it. [In a MS. of the Ait. Ár., India Office Library, 986, the entire work is described at the end as *Áśvaláyana-Bráhmaṇam Áraṇyakam*.]

³⁵ See *I. St.*, i. 387-392. I am now in possession of the complete text, but have nothing material to add to the above remarks. Great stress is laid upon keeping the particular doctrines secret, and upon

the high importance of those familiar with them. Among the names

tion, other than the one already noticed, namely, that in the second chapter of the second book the extant arrangement of the Rik-Sāmhita is given. Again, the number of teachers individually mentioned is very great, particularly in the third book—among them are two Śākalyas, a Kṛishṇa Hārīta, a Pañchālachanda—and this may be considered as an additional proof of its more recent origin, a conclusion already implied by the spirit and form of the opinions enunciated.³⁶

The Kaushītakāranyaka, in its present form, consists of three books; but it is uncertain whether it is complete.³⁷ It was only recently that I lighted upon the two first books.* These deal rather with ritual than with speculation. The third book is the so-called *Kaushītaky-Upanishad*,† a work of the highest interest and importance. Its first *adhyāya* gives us an extremely important account of the ideas held with regard to the path to, and arrival in, the world of the blessed, the significance of which in relation to similar ideas of other races is not yet quite apparent, but it promises to prove very rich in information. The second *adhyāya* gives us in the ceremonies which it describes, amongst other things, a very pleasing picture of the warmth and tenderness of family ties at that period. The third *adhyāya* is of inestimable value in connection with the history and development of the epic myth, inasmuch as it represents Indra battling with the same powers of nature that Arjuna in the epic subdues as evil demons. Lastly, the fourth *adhyāya* contains the second recension of a legend which also appears, under a somewhat different

³⁶ The circumstance here emphasised may be used to support the very opposite view; indeed I have so represented it in the similar case of the Lātyāyana-Sūtra (see below). This latter view now appears to me to have more in its favour.

³⁷ A manuscript sent to Berlin by Bühler (*MS. Or. fol.* 630) of the 'Sāukhāyana-Aranyaka' (as it is there called) presents it in 15 *adhyāyas*; the first two correspond to Ait. Ar. i., v.; *adhy.* 3-6 are made up of the Kaush. Up.; *adhy.* 7, 8 correspond to Ait. Ar. iii.; *adhy.*

9 gives the rivalry of the senses (like Śatap. Br. 14. 9. 2).

* See Catalogue of the Berlin Skr. MSS., p. 19, n. 82.

† See *I. St.*, i. 392-420. It would be very desirable to know on what Poley's assertion is founded, "that the Kaushītaki-Brāhmaṇa consists of nine *adhyāyas*, the first, seventh, eighth, and ninth of which form the Kaushītaki-Brāhmaṇa-Upanishad." I have not succeeded in finding any statement to this effect elsewhere. [See now Cowell's Preface, p. vii., to his edition of the Kaush. Up. in the *Bibl. Ind.*]

form, in the *Āraṇyaka* of the White Yajus, the legend, namely, of the instruction of a Brahman, who is very wise in his own esteem, by a warrior called Ajātaśatru, king of Kāśī. This Upanishad is also peculiarly rich in geographical data, throwing light upon its origin. Thus the name of Chitra Gāṅgyāyani, the wise king in the first *adhyāya* who instructs Āruni, clearly points to the Gāṅgā. According to ii. 10, the northern and southern mountains, *i.e.*, Himavanta and Vindhya, enclose in the eyes of the author the whole of the known world, and the list of the neighbouring tribes in iv. 1 perfectly accords with this. That, moreover, this Upanishad is exactly contemporaneous with the *Vrihad-Āraṇyaka* of the White Yajus is proved by the position of the names Āruni, Śvetaketu, Ajātaśatru, Gārgya Bālāki, and by the identity of the legends about the latter. [See *J. St.*, i. 392-420]

We have an interpretation of both *Āraṇyakas*, that is to say, of the second and third books of the *Aitareya-Āraṇyaka*, and of the third book of the *Kaushītaki-Āraṇyaka* in the commentary of Saṃkarāchārya, a teacher who lived about the eighth century A.D.,³³ and who was of the highest importance for the Vedānta school. For not only did he interpret all the Vedic texts, that is, all the Upanishads, upon which that school is founded, he also commented on the Vedānta-Sūtra itself, besides composing a number of smaller works with a view to elucidate and establish the Vedānta doctrine. His explanations, it is true, are often forced, from the fact of their having to accommodate themselves to the Vedānta system; still they are of high importance for us. Pupils of his, Ānandajñāna, Ānandagiri, Ānandatīrtha, and others, in their turn composed glosses on his commentaries. Of most of these commentaries and glosses we are now in possession, as they have been recently edited, together with their Upanishads, by Dr. Roer, Secretary to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, a periodical appearing under the auspices of that Society, and devoted exclusively

³³ Śaṅkara's date has not, unfortunately, been more accurately determined as yet. He passes at the same time for a zealous adversary of the Buddhists, and is therefore

called a Śaiva, or follower of Śiva. In his works, however, he appears as a worshipper of Vāsudeva, whom he puts forward as the real incarnation or representative of *brahman*.

to the publication of texts. Unfortunately the Kaushī-taki-Upanishad is not yet among the number, neither is the Maitrāyany-Upanishad, of which we have to speak in the sequel. It is, however, to be hoped that we shall yet receive both.³⁹—And may yet a third, the Vāshkala-Upanishad, be recovered and added to the list of these Upanishads of the Rik! It is at present only known to us through Anquetil Duperron's *Oupnekhat*, ii. 366–371; the original must therefore have been extant at the time of the Persian translation (rendered into Latin by Anquetil) of the principal Upanishads (1656). The Vāshkala-Śruti is repeatedly mentioned by Śāyana. We have seen above that a particular recension of the Rik-Saṃhitā, which has likewise been lost, is attributed to the Vāshkalas. This Upanishad is therefore the one sorry relic left to us of an extensive cycle of literature. It rests upon a legend repeatedly mentioned in the Brāhmaṇas, which in substance, and one might almost say in name also, corresponds to the Greek legend of Gaury-Medes. Medhātithi, the son of Kanva, is carried up to heaven by Indra, who has assumed the form of a ram, and during their flight he inquires of Indra who he is. Indra, in reply, smilingly declares himself to be the All-god, identifying himself with the universe. As to the cause of the abduction, he goes on to say that, delighted with Medhātithi's penance, he desired to conduct him into the right path leading to truth; he must therefore have no further misgiving. With regard to the date of this Upanishad, nothing more definite can of course at present be said than that its general tenor points to a tolerably high antiquity.⁴⁰

We now descend to the last stage in the literature of the Rigveda, viz., to its *Sūtras*.

First, of the *Śrauta-Sūtras*, or text-books of the sacrificial rite. Of these we possess two, the *Sūtra* of Āśvalāyana in 12 *adhyāyas*, and that of Śāṅkhāyana in 18

³⁹ Both have now been published and translated by Cowell in the *Bibliotheca Indica*. The Kaush.-Up. (Calc. 1861) is accompanied with the comm. of Saṃkarānanda, the

Maitri-Up. with that of Rāmānirṭha (1863–69).

⁴⁰ See now my special paper on the subject in *I. St.*, ix. 38–42; the original text has not yet been met with.

adhyāyas. The former connects itself with the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, the latter with the Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa, and from these two works frequent literal quotations are respectively borrowed. From this circumstance alone, as well as from the general handling of the subject, we might infer that these Sūtras are of comparatively recent origin; and direct testimony is not wanting to establish the fact. Thus the name Āśvalāyana is probably to be traced back to Āśvala, whom we find mentioned in the Āranyaka of the White Yajus as the Hotar of Janaka, king of Videha (see *I. St.*, i 441). Again, the formation of the word by the affix *āyana*,* probably leads us to the time of established schools (*ayana*)². However this may be, names formed in this way occur but seldom in the Brāhmaṇas themselves, and only in their latest portions, in general, therefore, they always betoken a late period. We find corroboration of this in the data supplied by the contents of the Āśvalāyana-Sūtra. Among the teachers there quoted is an Āsamarathya, whose *kalpa* (doctrine) is considered by the scholiast on Pāṇini, iv. 3. 105, probably following the Mahābhāṣya,⁴¹ as belonging to the new *kalpas* implied in this rule, in contradistinction to the old *kalpas*. If, then, the authorities quoted by Āśvalāyana were regarded as recent, Āśvalāyana himself must of course have been still more modern; and therefore we conclude, assuming this statement to originate from the Mahābhāṣya,⁴¹ that Āśvalāyana was nearly contemporaneous with Pāṇini. Another teacher quoted by Āśvalāyana, Taulvali, is expressly mentioned by Pāṇini (ii. 4. 61) as belonging to the *prāñchas*, or "dwellers in the east."—At the end there is a specially interesting enumeration of the various Brāhmaṇa-families, and their distribution among the family stems of Bhrigu, Aṅgiras, Atri, Viśvāmitra, Kaśyapa, Vasishtha, and Agastya.—The sacrifices on the Sarasvatī, of which I shall treat in the sequel, are here only briefly touched upon, and this with some differences in the

* As in the case of Āgniveśyā-
kāyana (?), Lāmakāyana, Vārshyā-
yani, Śakatyāna, Śāṅkhāyana, Śā-
trāyana, Śāṇḍilyāyana, Śāṅgikāyana,
Sātyāyana, Śaulvāyana, &c.

⁴¹ The name is not known in the
Mahābhāṣya, see *I. St.*, xii. 455

names, which may well be considered as later corruptions. We have also already seen that Āśvalāyana is the author of the fourth book of the Aitareya-Āraṇyaka, as also that he was the pupil of Śaunaka, who is stated to have destroyed his own Sūtra in favour of his pupil's work.

The Sūtra of Śāṅkhāyana wears in general a somewhat more ancient aspect, particularly in the fifteenth and sixteenth books, where it assumes the appearance of a Brāhmaṇa. The seventeenth and eighteenth books are a later addition, and are also ranked independently, and separately commented upon. They correspond to the first two books of the Kaushītaki-Āraṇyaka.

From my but superficial acquaintance with them, I am not at present in a position to give more detailed information as to the contents and mutual relation of these two Sūtras.⁴² My conjecture would be that their differences may rest upon local grounds also, and that the Sūtra of Āśvalāyana, as well as the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, may belong to the eastern part of Hindustān; the Sūtra of Śāṅkhāyana, on the contrary, like his Brāhmaṇa, rather to the western.* The order of the ceremonial is pretty much the same in both, though the great sacrifices of the kings, &c., viz., *rājapeya* (sacrifice for the prospering of the means of subsistence), *rājasūya* (consecration of the king), *aśvamedha* (horse sacrifice), *purushamedha* (human sacrifice), *sarvamedha* (universal sacrifice), are handled by Śāṅkhāyana with far more minuteness.

For Āśvalāyana I find mention made of a commentary by Nārāyaṇa,⁴³ the son of Krishṇajit, a grandson of Śrīpati. A namesake of his, but son of Paśupatiśarman,

⁴² The Āśvalāyana-Sūtra has since been printed, *Bibl. Ind.* (Calc. 1864-74), accompanied with the comm. of Nārāyaṇa Gārgya, edited by Rāma-Nārāyaṇa and Anandachandra. A special comparison of it with the Śāṅkhāyana-Sūtra is still wanting. Bühler, *Catalogue of MSS. from Gujārāt*, i. 154 (1871), cites a commentary by Devatrāta on the Āśv. Śr. S., likewise a partial one by Vidyāraṇya.

* Perhaps to the Naimisha forest (?). See below, p. 59.

⁴³ This is a confusion. The above-named Nārāyaṇa wrote a commentary upon the Śāṅkhāyana-Grihya; but the one who commented the Āśvalāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra calls himself in the introduction a son of Narasiṅha, just as Nārāyaṇa, the commentator of the Uttara-Naiśhadhiya, does, who, according to tradition (Roer, Pref., p. viii., 1855), lived some five hundred years ago. Are these two to be regarded as one and the same person? See *I. Str.*, 2, 298 (1869).

composed a *paddhati* ('outlines') to Śāṅkhāyana, after the example of one Brahmadatta. When he lived is uncertain, but we may with some probability assign him to the sixteenth century. According to his own statements he was a native of Malayadeśa. Further, for the Sūtra of Śāṅkhāyana we have the commentary of Varadattasuta Ānarttiya. Three of its *adhyāyas* were lost, and have been supplied by Dāsaśarman Muñjasūnu, viz., the ninth, tenth, and eleventh⁴⁴ On the last two *adhyāyas*, xvii., xviii., there is a commentary by Govinda. That these commentaries were preceded by others, which, however, have since been lost, is obvious, and is besides expressly stated by Ānarttiya.

Of the *Grihya-Sūtras* of the Rigveda we likewise only possess two, those of Āśvalāyana (in four *adhyāyas*) and of Śāṅkhāyana (in six *adhyāyas*). That of Śaunaka is indeed repeatedly mentioned, but it does not seem to be any longer in existence.

However widely they may differ as to details, the contents of the two works are essentially identical, especially as regards the order and distribution of the matter. They treat mainly, as I have already stated (p. 17), of the ceremonies to be performed in the various stages of conjugal and family life, before and after a birth, at marriage, at the time of and after a death. Besides these, however, manners and customs of the most diverse character are depicted, and "in particular, the sayings and formulas to be uttered on different occasions bear the impress of a very high antiquity, and frequently carry us back into the time when Brahmanism had not yet been developed" (see Stenzler in *I. St.*, ii. 159). It is principally popular and superstitious notions that are found in them; thus, we are pointed to star-worship, to astrology, portents, and witchcraft, and more especially to the adoration and propitiation of the evil powers in nature, the averting of their malign influence, &c. It is especially in the *pitritarpana*, or oblation to the Manes, that we find a decisive proof of

⁴⁴ Sections 3-5 of the fourth book have been published by Donner in his *Pindapitryajna* (Berlin, 1870), and the section relating to the legend of Śunahśepa (xv. 17-27) by

Streiter (1861); the variants presented therein to the parallel passage in the Ait. Brāhm. had already been given by M. Müller, *A. S. L.*, p. 573, ff.



composed a *paddhati* ('outlines') to Śāṅkhāyana, after the example of one Brahmadatta. When he lived is uncertain, but we may with some probability assign him to the sixteenth century. According to his own statements he was a native of Malayadeśa. Further, for the Sūtra of Śāṅkhāyana we have the commentary of Varadattasuta Ānarttiya. Three of its *adhyāyas* were lost, and have been supplied by Dāsaśarma Muñjasūnu, viz., the ninth, tenth, and eleventh.⁴⁴ On the last two *adhyāyas*, xvii., xviii., there is a commentary by Govinda. That these commentaries were preceded by others, which, however, have since been lost, is obvious, and is besides expressly stated by Ānarttiya.

Of the *Grihya-Sūtras* of the Rīgveda we likewise only possess two, those of Āśvalāyana (in four *adhyāyas*) and of Śāṅkhāyana (in six *adhyāyas*). That of Śaunaka is indeed repeatedly mentioned, but it does not seem to be any longer in existence.

However widely they may differ as to details, the contents of the two works are essentially identical, especially as regards the order and distribution of the matter. They treat mainly, as I have already stated (p. 17), of the ceremonies to be performed in the various stages of conjugal and family life, before and after a birth, at marriage, at the time of and after a death. Besides these, however, manners and customs of the most diverse character are depicted, and "in particular, the sayings and formulas to be uttered on different occasions bear the impress of a very high antiquity, and frequently carry us back into the time when Brahmanism had not yet been developed" (see Stenzler in *I. St.*, ii. 159). It is principally popular and superstitious notions that are found in them; thus, we are pointed to star-worship, to astrology, portents, and witchcraft, and more especially to the adoration and propitiation of the evil powers in nature, the averting of their malign influence, &c. It is especially in the *piṭritarpana*, or oblation to the Manes, that we find a decisive proof of

⁴⁴ Sections 3-5 of the fourth book have been published by Donner in his *Pindapitriyajña* (Berlin, 1870), and the section relating to the legend of Śunaśēpa (xv. 17-27) by

Streiter (1861); the variants presented therein to the parallel passage in the *Art. Brāhm.* had already been given by M. Müller, *A. S. L.*, p. 573, ff.

composed a *paddhati* ('outlines') to Śāṅkhāyana, after the example of one Brahmadatta. When he lived is uncertain, but we may with some probability assign him to the sixteenth century. According to his own statements he was a native of Malayadeśa. Further, for the Sūtra of Śāṅkhāyana we have the commentary of Varadattasuta Ānarttiya. Three of its *adhyāyas* were lost, and have been supplied by Dāsaśarma Muñjasūnu, viz, the ninth, tenth, and eleventh.⁴⁴ On the last two *adhyāyas*, xvii, xviii, there is a commentary by Govinda. That these commentaries were preceded by others, which, however, have since been lost, is obvious, and is besides expressly stated by Ānarttiya.

Of the *Grihya-Sūtras* of the R̥gveda we likewise only possess two, those of Āśvalāyana (in four *adhyāyas*) and of Śāṅkhāyana (in six *adhyāyas*). That of Śaunaka is indeed repeatedly mentioned, but it does not seem to be any longer in existence.

However widely they may differ as to details, the contents of the two works are essentially identical, especially as regards the order and distribution of the matter. They treat mainly, as I have already stated (p. 17), of the ceremonies to be performed in the various stages of conjugal and family life, before and after a birth, at marriage, at the time of and after a death. Besides these, however, manners and customs of the most diverse character are depicted, and "in particular, the sayings and formulas to be uttered on different occasions bear the impress of a very high antiquity, and frequently carry us back into the time when Brahmanism had not yet been developed" (see Stenzler in *I. St.*, ii. 159). It is principally popular and superstitious notions that are found in them; thus, we are pointed to star-worship, to astrology, portents, and witchcraft, and more especially to the adoration and propitiation of the evil powers in nature, the averting of their malign influence, &c. It is especially in the *piṭritarpana*, or oblation to the Manes, that we find a decisive proof of

Streiter (1861); the variants presented therein to the parallel passage in the Ait. Brāhma had already been given by M. Müller, *A. S. L.*, p. 573, ff.

gend of Śunahśepa (xv. 17-27) by

the modern composition of these works, as the forefathers are there enumerated individually by name—a custom which, although in itself it may be very ancient (as we find a perfect analogy to it in the Yeshts and Nerengs of the Parsís), yet in this particular application belongs to a very recent period, as is apparent from the names themselves. For not only are the Rishis of the Rik-Samhitá cited in their extant order, but all those names are likewise mentioned which we encounter as particularly significant in the formation of the different schools of the Rik, as well as in connection with its Bráhmaṇas and Sūtras; for example, Váshkala, Śákalya, Mándúkeya, Aitareya, Paiṅgya, Kaushítaka, Śaunaka, Áśvaláyana, and Śáṅkháyana themselves, &c. Joined to these, we find other names with which we are not yet otherwise acquainted, as also the names of three female sages, one of whom, Gárgí Váchaknaví, meets us repeatedly in the Vṛihad-Áraṇyaka of the White Yajus, as residing at the court of Janaka. The second⁴⁵ is unknown; but the name of the third, Sulabhá Maitreyí, is both connected with this very Janaka in the legends of the Mahá-Bhárata,* and also points us to the *Saulabháni Bráhmaṇáni*, quoted by the scholiast on Páṇini, iv. 3. 105, probably on the authority of the Mahábháshya,⁴⁶ as an instance of the ‘modern’ Bráhmaṇas implied by this rule. Immediately after the Rishis of the Rik-Samhitá, we find mention of other names and works which have not yet been met with in any other part of Vedic literature. In the Śáṅkháyana-Grihya we have these: *Sumantu-Jaimini-Vaiśampáyana-Paila-sūtra-bháshya* [-Gárgya-Babhru] . . .; and in the Áśvaláyana-Grihya these: *Sumantu-Jaimini-Vaiśampáyana-Paila-sūtra-bhárata-mahábhárata-dharmácháryáh*.⁴⁷ The latter

⁴⁵ Her name is Vadaṇá Práthi-theýí; a teacher called Práthi is mentioned in the Vaṇśa-Bráhmaṇa of the Sámaveda.

* [Cf. Śaṅkara's statements as to this in Ved. Sūtrabh. to iii. 3. 32, p. 915, ed. Rāma Nārāyaṇa.] Buddha's uncle is called by the Buddhists Sulabha; see Schiefner, *Leben des Sākyamuni*, p. 6.

⁴⁶ See on this *I. St.*, xiii. 429.

They are there cited a second time also, to Páṇ., iv. 2. 68, and are explained by Kaiyaṭa as *Sulabhena proktāni*.

⁴⁷ The word *bháshya* is to be inserted above between *sūtra* and *bhárata*; though wanting in the MS. used by me at the time when I wrote, it is found in all the other MSS.

passage is evidently the more modern, and although we must not suppose that the Mahá-Bhárata in its present form is here referred to, still, in the expression "*Vaiśampáyano mahábháratácháryah*," apparently indicated by this passage, there must at all events be implied a work of some compass, treating of the same legend, and therefore forming the basis of our extant text. The passage seems also to indicate that the same material had already been handled a second time by Jaimini, whose work, however, can have borne but a distant resemblance to the Jaimini-Bhárata of the present day. We shall find in the sequel frequent confirmation of the fact that the origin of the epic and the systematic development of Vedic literature in its different schools belong to the same period. Of a Súra by Sumantu, and a Dharma by Paila, we have no knowledge whatever. It is only in more modern times, in the Puráṇas and in the legal literature proper, that I find a work attributed to Sumantu, namely, a Smṛiti-Śástra; while to Paila (whose name appears from Pán. iv. 1. 118) is ascribed the revelation of the Rígveda—a circumstance which at least justifies the inference that he played a special part in the definitive completion of its school development.—It is, however, possible to give a wholly different interpretation of the passage from Áśvaláyana; and in my opinion it would be preferable to do so. We may divest the four proper names of any special relation to the names of the four works, and regard the two groups as independent,⁴³ as we must evidently assume them to be in the Śáṅkháyaṇa-Grihya.* If this be done, then what most readily suggests itself in connection with the passage is the manner in which the Puráṇas apportion

⁴³ This interpretation becomes imperative after the rectification of the text (see the previous note), according to which no longer four, but five names of works are in question.

* What is meant in the latter [and cf. note 47 in the Áśv. Grih. too] by the word *bhāṣya*, appears from the Prátiśákhya of the White Yajus, where (i. 1. 19, 20) *vedeshu* and *bhāṣyeshu* are found in contradis-

tinction to one another, just as in the Prátiśákhya of the Black Yajus (ii. 12) we find *chāṇandas* and *bhāṣhā*, and in Yáska *anvadhya* and *bhāṣhā*. We must, therefore, understand by it 'works in *bhāṣhā*,' though the meaning of the word is here more developed than in the works just mentioned, and approaches the sense in which Páṇini uses it. I shall return to the subject further on.

the modern composition of these works, as the forefathers are there enumerated individually by name—a custom which, although in itself it may be very ancient (as we find a perfect analogy to it in the Yeshts and Nerengs of the Parsís), yet in this particular application belongs to a very recent period, as is apparent from the names themselves. For not only are the Rishis of the Rik-Saṃhitá cited in their extant order, but all those names are likewise mentioned which we encounter as particularly significant in the formation of the different schools of the Rik, as well as in connection with its Bráhmaṇas and Sūtras; for example, Váshkala, Śákalya, Mándúkeya, Aitareya, Pañgya, Kaushítaka, Śaunaka, Ásvaláyana, and Śáñkháyana themselves, &c. Joined to these, we find other names with which we are not yet otherwise acquainted, as also the names of three female sages, one of whom, Gárgí Váchaknaví, meets us repeatedly in the Vṛihad-Áranyaka of the White Yajus, as residing at the court of Janaka. The second⁴⁵ is unknown; but the name of the third, Sulabhá Maitreyí, is both connected with this very Janaka in the legends of the Mahá-Bhárata,* and also points us to the *Saulabháni Bráhmaṇáni*, quoted by the scholiast on Páṇini, iv. 3. 105, probably on the authority of the Mahábháshya,⁴⁶ as an instance of the ‘modern’ Bráhmaṇas implied by this rule. Immediately after the Rishis of the Rik-Saṃhitá, we find mention of other names and works which have not yet been met with in any other part of Vedic literature. In the Śáñkháyana-Grihya we have these: *Sumantu-Jaimini-Vaiśampáyana-Paila-sūtra-bháshya* [-Gárgya-Babhrú] . . .; and in the Ásvaláyana-Grihya these: *Sumantu-Jaimini-Vaiśampáyana-Paila-sūtra-bhárata-mahábhárata-dharmácháryáh*.⁴⁷ The latter

⁴⁵ Her name is Vaḍavá Práti-theýí; a teacher called Pratiṭhi is mentioned in the Vaṇsa-Bráhmaṇa of the Sámaveda.

* [Cf. Śaṃkara's statements as to this in Ved. Sūtrabh. to iii. 3. 32, p. 915, ed. Ráma Náráyaṇa.] Buddha's uncle is called by the Buddhists Sulabha; see Schiefner, *Leben des Sákyamuni*, p. 6.

⁴⁶ See on this *I. St.*, xiii. 429.

They are there cited a second time also, to Páṇ., iv. 2. 68, and are explained by Kaiyaṭa as *Sulabhena proktáni*.

⁴⁷ The word *bháshya* is to be inserted above between *sūtra* and *bhárata*; though wanting in the MS. used by me at the time when I wrote, it is found in all the other MSS.

passage is evidently the more modern, and although we must not suppose that the Mahá-Bhárata in its present form is here referred to, still, in the expression "*Vaiśampáyano mahábháratácháryah*," apparently indicated by this passage, there must at all events be implied a work of some compass, treating of the same legend, and therefore forming the basis of our extant text. The passage seems also to indicate that the same material had already been handled a second time by Jaimini, whose work, however, can have borne but a distant resemblance to the Jaimini-Bhárata of the present day. We shall find in the sequel frequent confirmation of the fact that the origin of the epic and the systematic development of Vedic literature in its different schools belong to the same period. Of a Sûtra by Sumantu, and a Dharma by Paila, we have no knowledge whatever. It is only in more modern times, in the Puráṇas and in the legal literature proper, that I find a work attributed to Sumantu, namely, a Smṛiti-Śástra; while to Paila (whose name appears from Pán iv. i. 118) is ascribed the revelation of the Rígveda—a circumstance which at least justifies the inference that he played a special part in the definitive completion of its school development.—It is, however, possible to give a wholly different interpretation of the passage from Áśvaláyana; and in my opinion it would be preferable to do so. We may divest the four proper names of any special relation to the names of the four works, and regard the two groups as independent,⁴³ as we must evidently assume them to be in the Śáṅkháyana-Grihya.* If this be done, then what most readily suggests itself in connection with the passage is the manner in which the Puráṇas apportion

⁴³ This interpretation becomes imperative after the rectification of the text (see the previous note), according to which no longer four, but five names of works are in question.

* What is meant in the latter [and cf. note 47 in the Áśv. Gríh. too] by the word *bhāṣhya*, appears from the Prátisākhya of the White Yajus, where (i. i. 19, 20) *redeshu* and *bhāṣyeshu* are found in contradic-

tion to one another, just as in the Prátisākhya of the Black Yajus (ii. 12) we find *chhandas* and *bhāṣhā*, and in Yáska *anvadhya* and *bhāṣhā*. We must, therefore, understand by it 'works in *bhāṣhā*,' though the meaning of the word is here more developed than in the works just mentioned, and approaches the sense in which Pánini uses it. I shall return to the subject further on.

the revelation of the several Vedas; inasmuch as they assign the Atharvaveda to Sumantu, the Sāmaveda to Jaimini, the Yajurveda to Vaiśampāyana, and the Rigveda to Paila. But in either case we must assume with Roth, who first pointed out the passage in Āśvalāyana (*op. c.*, p. 27), that this passage, as well as the one in Śāṅkhāyana, has been touched up by later interpolation;⁴⁹ otherwise the dates of these two Gṛihya-Sūtras would be brought down too far! For although, from the whole tenor of both passages, that in the Āśvalāyana-Gṛihya, as well as that in the Śāṅkhāyana-Gṛihya—which for the rest present other material discrepancies of detail—it is sufficiently clear that they presuppose the literature of the Rigveda as entirely closed, still the general attitude of both works shows their comparatively ancient origin.—The question whether any connection exists between the Smṛiti-Śāstra of Śāṅkha and the Gṛihya-Sūtra of Śāṅkhāyana, remains still unanswered.

For both Gṛihya-Sūtras there are commentaries by the same Nārāyaṇa who commented the Śrauta-Sūtra of Āśvalāyana.⁵⁰ They probably belong to the fifteenth century.* There are, besides, as in the case of the Śrauta-Sūtras,

⁴⁹ We find the *Sumantu-Jaimini-Vaiśampāyana-Pailādyā āchāryāḥ* quoted a second time in the Śāṅkh. G., in its last section (vi. 6), which is probably of later origin; and here, without any doubt, the reference is to the same distribution of the four Vedas among the above-named personages which occurs in the Vishnu-Purāṇa, iii. 4. S. 9. Both times the representative of the Atharvan comes first, that of the Rik last, which in a Rik text serves as a clear proof that we have here to do with later appendages. A similar precedence is given to the Atharvaveda in the Mahābhāṣya; cf. *I. St.*, xiii. 431.

⁵⁰ This is a mistake, see note 43; all three Nārāyaṇas must be kept distinct. The commentator of the Āśval. Śr. S. calls himself a Gārgya, and son of Narasiṃha; the comm. of the Āśval. Gṛihya, a Naidhruva, and son of Divākara; the

comm. of the Śāṅkh. Gṛihya, son of Krishṇajit, and grandson of Śrīpati. (This third Nār. lived A.D. 1538; see Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., p. 354; sub No. 1282.)—The text of the Āśval. Gṛihya has been edited by Stenzler, with a translation (*Indische Hausregeln*, 1864-65); the text, with Nārāyaṇa's comm., by Rāmanārāyaṇa and Anandachandra, in *Bibl. Ind.* (1866-69). The sections relating to marriage ceremonies have been edited by Haas, *I. St.*, v. 283, ff.; those relating to funeral rites, by Müller, *Z. D. M. G.*, ix.

* Two glosses on Śaṅkara's commentary on the Prāśnopanishad and the Muṇḍakopanishad bear the same name, so that possibly the author of them is identical with the above-named Nārāyaṇa. Acc. to what has just been remarked in note 50, this must appear *a priori* very doubtful, since a considerable number of other

many small treatises in connection with the Grihya-Sūtras, some of them being summaries, in which the larger works are reduced to system. Among them is a Paddhati to the Śāṅkhāyana-Grihya by Rāmachandra, who lived in the Naimisha forest in the middle of the fifteenth century: and I am inclined to think that this Naimisha forest was the birthplace of the Sūtra itself. It is perhaps for this reason that the tradition connected with it was so well preserved in that district.

The extant *Pratīśākhya-Sūtra* of the Rik-Samhitā is ascribed to Śaunaka, who has been repeatedly mentioned already, and who was the teacher of Āśvalāyana. This extensive work is a metrical composition, divided into three *kāṇḍas*, of six *paṭalas* each, and containing 103 *kāṇḍikās* in all. The first information regarding it was given by Roth, *op. c.*, p. 53, ff. According to tradition, it is of more ancient origin than the Sūtras of Āśvalāyana just mentioned, which only purport to be written by the pupil of this Śaunaka; but whether it really was composed by the latter, or whether it is not much more probably merely the work of his school, must for the present remain undecided. The names quoted in it are in part identical with those met with in Yāska's Nirukti and in the Sūtra of Pāṇini. The contents of the work itself are, however, as yet but little known⁵¹ in their details. Of special interest are those passages which treat of the correct and incorrect pronunciation of words in general. There is an excellent commentary on it by Uata, which professes in the introduction to be a remodelling of an earlier commentary by Viṣṇuputra.—The *Upalekha* is to be con-

authors bear the same name. But in this particular case we are able to bring forward definite reasons against this identification. The

he is probably identical with the author of the *dīpikā* on the small Atharvopanishads published in the *Diil. Ind.* in 1872, who (*ibid.*, p. 393) is called *Bhatta Nārāyaṇa*, and son of Bhatta Ratnākara.]

rather *Rāyanendrasarasvatī* (?). The glossarist of the *Muṇḍakop.*, on the other hand, was, according to *I. St.*, 2. 470, called *Nardyanabhaffa*; and

⁵¹ We are now in possession of two editions of this most important work, text and translation, with elucidatory notes, by Ad. Regnier (Paris, 1857-58), and M. Muller (Leipzig, 1856-69); see *I. Str.*, 2. 94, ff., 127, ff., 159, ff.; *Lit. Centralblatt*, 1870, p. 530.

sidered as an epitome of the *Prātisākhya-Sūtra*, and to some extent as a supplement to it [specially to chapters x. xi.]. It is a short treatise, numbered among the *Parīśiṣṭas* (supplements); and it has in its turn been repeatedly commented upon.⁵²

A few other treatises have still to be noticed here, which, although they bear the high-sounding name of *Vedāṅgas*, or 'members of the Veda,' are yet, as above stated (p. 25), only to be looked upon as later supplements to the literature of the *Rigveda*: the *Sikṣā*, the *Chhandas*, and the *Jyotiṣa*. All three exist in a double recension according as they profess to belong to the *Rigveda* or to the *Yajurveda*. The *Chhandas* is essentially alike in both recensions, and we have to recognise in it the *Sūtra* on prosody ascribed to Piṅgala.⁵³ It is, moreover, like both the other treatises, of very recent origin. We have a proof of this, for instance, in the fact that, in the manner peculiar to the Indians, it expresses numbers by words,⁵⁴ and feet by letters, and that it treats of the highly elaborated metres, which are only found in modern poetry.⁵⁵ The part dealing with Vedic metres may perhaps be more ancient. The teachers quoted in it bear in part comparatively ancient

⁵² Edited by W. Perisch (Berlin, 1854); this tract treats of the *krana-jāpī*, an extended form of the *prajapāṭha*, which at the same time gives the text in the *samhitā* form, namely, each word twice, first joined with the preceding, and then with the following word (thus: *ab, bc, cd, de . . .*). There are also other still more complicated modes of reciting the *Vedas*, as to which cf. Thibaut in his edition of the *Jatīpātala* (1870), p. 36, ff. The next step, called *japī*, exhibits the text in the following manner: *ab ba ab, bc cb bc*, and MSS. of this kind have actually been preserved, e.g., in the case of the *Vājas. Samh.* The following step, called *ghana*, is said to be still in use: cf. Bhandarkar, *Indian Antiquary*, iii. 133; Haug, *Ueber das Wesen des religiösen Accents*, p. 58: it runs: *ab ba abc cba cba, bc cba bc ted deb ted*.

⁵³ Edited and commented by myself in *I. St.*, viii. (1863); the text, together with the commentary of Halāyudha, edited by Viśvanātha-śāstrin in *Bibl. Indica* (1871-72).

⁵⁴ See Alibrúni's account in Weopcke's *Mémoire sur la prononciation des chiffres indiens*, p. 102, ff. (1863). Burnell, *Elem. of S. I. Palaeogr.*, p. 58.

⁵⁵ On the other hand, there are metres taught in this work which but rarely occur in modern literature, and which must be looked upon as obsolete and out of fashion. Therefore, in spite of what has been said above, we must carry back the date of its composition to a period about simultaneous with the close of the Vedic *Sūtra* literature, or the commencement of the later modern and elaborated literatures; see *I. St.*, viii. 173, 178.

names. These are: Kraushtuki, Táṇḍin, Yáska, Saitava, Ráta, and Mándavya. The recensions most at variance with each other are those of the Śikshá and Jyotisha respectively. The former work is in both recensions directly traced to Pāṇini, the latter to Lagadha, or Lagata, an otherwise unknown name in Indian literature.*—Besides the Pāṇinīyá Śikshá, there is another bearing the name of the Mándúkas, which therefore may more directly follow the Rik, and which is at any rate a more important work than the former. As a proof of the antiquity of the name 'Śikshá' for phonetic investigations, we may adduce the circumstance that in the Taitt Áraṇy., vii. 1, we find a section beginning thus: "we will explain the Śikshá;" whereupon it gives the titles of the topics of the oral exposition which we may suppose to have been connected therewith (*I. St.*, ii. 211), and which, to judge by these titles, must have embraced letters, accents, quantity, articulation, and the rules of euphony, that is to say, the same subjects discussed in the two existing Śikshás.⁶⁶

Of the writings called *Anukramanī*, in which the metre, the deity, and the author of each song are given in their proper order, several have come down to us for the Rik-Saṃhitá, including an *Anuvákānukramanī* by Śaunaka, and a *Sarvānukramanī* by Kátyáyana.⁶⁷ For both of these we have an excellent commentary by Shadguru-

* Renaud in his *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, pp. 331, 332, adduces from Albírúni a Láta, who passed for the author of the old Súrya-Siddhánta, might he not be identical with this Lagadha, Lagata? According to Colebr., *Ess.*, ii. 409, Brahmagupta quotes a Ládhabhárýa; this name also could be traced to Lagadha [By Súrýadeva, a scholiast of Áryabhata, the author of the Jyotisha is cited under the name of Lagadábhárýa; see Kern, Preface to the Áryabhatīya, p. ix, 1874. An edition of the text of the Jyotisha, together with extracts from Somákara's commentary and explanatory notes, was published by me in 1862 under the title: *Ueber den Vedakalender, Namens Jyotisham*]

⁶⁶ The Pāṇinīyá Śikshá has been printed with a translation in *I. St.*, iv. 345-371 (1858); on the numerous other treatises bearing the same name, see Rájendra Lála Mitra, *Notices of Sanskrit MSS.*, i. 71, ff.

xiv. 160.

⁶⁷ In substance published by Muller in the sixth volume of his large edition of the Rik, pp. 621-671.

I now turn to the *Sāmaveda*.*

The *Samhitā* of the *Sāmaveda* is an anthology taken from the *Rik-Samhitā*, comprising those of its verses which were intended to be chanted at the ceremonies of the Soma sacrifice. Its arrangement would seem to be guided by the order of the *Rik-Samhitā*; but here, as in the case of the two *Samhitās* of the *Yajus*, we must not think to find any continuous connection. Properly speaking, each verse is to be considered as standing by itself: it only receives its real sense when taken in connection with the particular ceremony to which it belongs. So stands the case at least in the first part of the *Sāma-Samhitā*. This is divided into six *prapāṭhakas*, each of which † consists of ten *daśats* or decades, of ten verses each, a division which existed as early as the time of the second part of the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, and within which the separate verses are distributed according to the deities to whom they are addressed. The first twelve decades contain invocations of *Agni*, the last eleven invocations of *Soma*, while the thirty-six intermediate ones are for the most part addressed to *Indra*. The second part of the *Sāma-Samhitā*, on the contrary, which is divided into nine *prapāṭhakas*, each of which again is subdivided into two or occasionally three sections, invariably presents several, usually three, verses closely connected with one another, and forming an independent group, the first of them having generally appeared already in the first part. The principle of distribution here is as yet obscure.⁵⁹ In the *Samhitā* these verses are still exhibited in their *rich*-form, although with the *sāman*-accents; but in addition to this we have four *gānas*, or song-books, in which they appear in their *sāman*-form. For, in singing they were consider-

* See *I. St.*, i. 28-66.

† Except the last, which contains only nine decades.

⁵⁹ The first part of the *Samhitā* is referred to under the names *ārchika*, *chandas*, *chandasikā*, the second as *uttarārchika* or *uttarā*; the designation of the latter as *staubhika* (see *I. St.*, i. 29, 30, 66), into the

use of which my example has misled Muller also, *History of A. S. L.*, p. 473, n., is wrong, see *Monatsberichte der Berl. Acad.*, 1868, p. 238. According to Durga, the author of the *padapāṭha* of the *Sāma-Samhitā* was a *Gārgya*; see Roth, *Comm.*, p. 39 (respecting this family, see *I. St.*, xiii. 411).

certainty were borrowed from the same period, before the had as yet taken place; so that in the interval they suffered a good deal of wearing down in the mouth of the people, which was avoided in the case of the *richas* applied as *sāmans*, and so protected by being used in worship. The fact has also already been stated that no verses have been received into the Sāma-Samhitā from those songs of the Rik-Samhitā which must be considered as the most modern. Thus we find no *sāmans* borrowed from the Purusha-Sūkta, in the ordinary recensions at least, for the school of the Naigeyas has, in fact, incorporated the first five verses of it into the seventh *prapāṭhaka* of the first part—a section which is peculiar to this school. The Sāma-Samhitā, being a purely derivative production, gives us no clue towards the determination of its date. It has come down to us in two recensions, on the whole differing but little from each other, one of which belongs to the school of the Rāṇāyanīyas, the other to that of the Kauthumas. Of this latter the school of the Negas, or Naigeyas, alluded to above, is a subdivision, of which two Anukramanīs at least, one of the deities and one of the Rishis of the several verses, have been preserved to us.⁶⁰ Not one of these three names has as yet been traced in Vedic literature; it is only in the Sūtras of the Sāmaveda itself that the first and second at least are mentioned, but even here the name of the Negas does not appear.—The text of the Rāṇāyanīyas was edited and translated, with strict reference to Śāyana's commentary, by the missionary Stevenson in 1842; since 1848 we have been in possession of another edition, furnished with a complete glossary and much

⁶⁰ The seventh *prapāṭhaka*, which is peculiar to it, has since been discovered. It bears the title Aranyaka-Samhitā, and has been edited by Siegfried Goldschmidt in *Monatsberichte der Berl. Acad.* 1868, pp. 228-248. The editor points out that the Aranya-gāna is based upon the *archika* of the Naigeya text (*l. c.*, p. 238), and that MSS. have probably been preserved of its *uttarārchika* also (p. 241).—A London MS. of Bharatasvāmīn's Sāmavedavivarāṇa

specially refers to the Aranyaka-Samhitā, see Burnell, *Catalogue of Vedic MSS.* (1870), p. 39.—Of the Aranyaka-gāna as well as of the Grāmageya-gāna we find, *ibid.*, p. 49, a text in the Jaimini-Śākhā also. According to Rājendra Lal Mitra (Preface to Translation of Chhând Up., p. 4), 'the Kauthuma (-Śākhā) is current in Guzerat, the Jaiminiya in Karnātaka, and the Rāṇāyanīya in Mahārāshṭra.'

additional material, together with translation, which we owe to Professor Benfey, of Göttingen.⁶¹

Although, from its very nature, the Samhitá of the Sāmaveda is poor in data throwing light upon the time of its origin, yet its remaining literature contains an abundance of these; and first of all, the *Bráhmaṇas*.

The first and most important of these is the *Táṇḍya Bráhmaṇa*, also called *Pañchaviṁśa*, from its containing twenty-five books. Its contents, it is true, are in the main of a very dry and unprofitable character; for in mystic trifling it often exceeds all bounds, as indeed it was the adherents of the Sāmaveda generally who carried matters furthest in this direction. Nevertheless, from its great extent, this work contains a mass of highly interesting legends, as well as of information generally. It refers solely to the celebration of the Soma sacrifices, and to the chanting of the *sāmans* accompanying it, which are quoted by their technical names. These sacrifices were celebrated in a great variety of ways; there is one special classification of them according as they extended over one day or several, or finally over more than twelve days.⁶² The latter, called *sattras*, or sessions, could only be performed by Brahmans, and that in considerable numbers, and might last 100 days, or even several years. In consequence of the great variety of ceremonies thus involved, each bears its own name, which is borrowed either from the object of its celebration, or the sage who was the first to celebrate it, or from other considerations. How far the order of the Samhitá is here observed has not yet been investigated,

⁶¹ Recently a new edition, likewise very meritorious, of the first two books, the *āgneyam* and the *ain-dram parva*, of the *ārchika* (up to i. 5. 2. 3. 10), has been published by Satyavrata Sāmāśramin, in the *Bibliotheca Indica* (1871-74), accompanied by the corresponding portions (*prapāthakas* 1-12) of the *Geyagūna*, and the complete commentary of Sāyaṇa, and other illustrative matter.—The division of the *sāmans* into *parvans* is first mentioned by Pāraskara, ii. 10 (*adhyā-dīn prabrātyād, rishimukhāni bah-ricchānām, parvāni chhandogānām*). Rāvaṇabhrāṣṭi; a on the Sāmaveda

is said to be still in existence in Malabar; see Rost, *I. St.*, ix. 176.

⁶² To each Soma sacrifice belong several (four at least) preparatory days; these are not here taken into account. The above division refers only to those days when Soma juice is expressed, that is, to the *sutyā* days. Soma sacrifices having only one such day are called *ekāha*; those with from two to twelve, *ahīna*. *Sattras* lasting a whole year, or even longer, are called *ayana*. For the *sutyā* festival there are seven fundamental forms, called *saṁsthā*; *I. St.*, x. 352-355.

but in any case it would be a mistake to suppose that for all the different sacrifices enumerated in the Bráhmaṇa corresponding prayers exist in the Samhitá. On the contrary, the latter probably only exhibits the verses to be chanted generally at all the Soma sacrifices; and the Bráhmaṇa must be regarded as the supplement in which the modifications for the separate sacrifices are given, and also for those which arose later. While, as we saw above (p. 14), a combination of verses of the Rik for the purpose of recitation bears the name *śastra*, a similar selection of different *sámans* united into a whole is usually called *uktha* (√ *vach*, to speak), *stoma* (√ *stu*, to praise), or *prishṭha* (√ *prachh*, to ask); and these in their turn, like the *śastras*, receive different appellations.⁶³

Of special significance for the time of the composition of the Tándya Bráhmaṇa are, on the one hand, the very minute descriptions of the sacrifices on the Sarasvatí and Drishadvatí; and, on the other, the Vrátyastomas, or sacrifices by which Indians of Aryan origin, but not living according to the Brahmanical system, obtained admission to the Brahman community. The accounts of these latter sacrifices are preceded by a description of the dress and mode of life of those who are to offer them. "They drive in open chariots of war, carry bows and lances, wear turbans, robes bordered with red and having fluttering ends, shoes, and sheepskins folded double; their leaders are distinguished by brown robes and silver neck-ornaments; they pursue neither agriculture nor commerce; their laws are in a constant state of confusion; they speak the same language as those who have received Brahmanical consecration, but nevertheless call what is easily spoken hard to pronounce." This last statement probably refers to

⁶³ The term directly opposed to *śastra* is, rather, *stotra*. *Prishṭha* specially designates several *stotras* belonging to the mid-day sacrifice, and forming, as it is expressed, its "back;" *uktha* is originally employed as a synonym of *śastra*, and only at a later period in the meaning of *saman* (*I. St.*, xiii. 447); *stoma*, lastly, is the name for the six, seven, or more ground-forms of the *stotras*, after which these latter are formed for the purposes of chanting.

The simple recitation of the *śastras* by the Hotar and his companions always comes after the chanting recitation of the same verses by the

upon the varying number of the *śastras* and *stotras* belonging to their *sutyá* days. See *I. St.*, x. 353, ff., ix 229.

additional material, together with translation, which we owe to Professor Benfey, of Göttingen.⁶¹

Although, from its very nature, the *Samhitā* of the *Sāmaveda* is poor in data throwing light upon the time of its origin, yet its remaining literature contains an abundance of these; and first of all, the *Brāhmaṇas*.

The first and most important of these is the *Tāndya Brāhmaṇa*, also called *Pañchariṇśa*, from its containing twenty-five books. Its contents, it is true, are in the main of a very dry and unprofitable character; for in mystic trifling it often exceeds all bounds, as indeed it was the adherents of the *Sāmaveda* generally who carried matters furthest in this direction. Nevertheless, from its great extent, this work contains a mass of highly interesting legends, as well as of information generally. It refers solely to the celebration of the Soma sacrifices, and to the chanting of the *sāmans* accompanying it, which are quoted by their technical names. These sacrifices were celebrated in a great variety of ways; there is one special classification of them according as they extended over one day or several, or finally over more than twelve days.⁶² The latter, called *sattras*, or sessions, could only be performed by Brahmans, and that in considerable numbers, and might last 100 days, or even several years. In consequence of the great variety of ceremonies thus involved, each bears its own name, which is borrowed either from the object of its celebration, or the sage who was the first to celebrate it, or from other considerations. How far the order of the *Samhitā* is here observed has not yet been investigated,

⁶¹ Recently a new edition, likewise very meritorious, of the first two books, the *agnēyam* and the *ain-dram parva*, of the *ārkhika* (up to i. 5. 2. 3. 10), has been published by Satyavrata Śamāsramin, in the *Bibliotheca Indica* (1871-74), accompanied by the corresponding portions (*prapāṭhikas* 1-12) of the Geyagīna, and the complete commentary of Śāyana, and other illustrative matter.—The division of the *sāmans* into *parrans* is first mentioned by Pāraskara, ii. 10 (*adhya-yādīn prabrūyād, rishimukhāni bah-vrichānām, parvāni chhandogānām*). A Rāvaṇabhāṣya on the *Sāmaveda*

is said to be still in existence in Malabar; see Rost, *I. St.*, ix. 176.

⁶² To each Soma sacrifice belong several (four at least) preparatory days; these are not here taken into account. The above division refers only to those days when Soma juice is expressed, that is, to the *sutyā* days. Soma sacrifices having only one such day are called *ekāha*; those with from two to twelve, *ahina*. *Sattras* lasting a whole year, or even longer, are called *ayana*. For the *sutyā* festival there are seven fundamental forms, called *saṃsthā*; *I. St.*, x. 352-355.

but in any case it would be a mistake to suppose that for all the different sacrifices enumerated in the Bráhmaṇa corresponding prayers exist in the Samhitá. On the contrary, the latter probably only exhibits the verses to be chanted generally at all the Soma sacrifices; and the Bráhmaṇa must be regarded as the supplement in which the modifications for the separate sacrifices are given, and also for those which arose later. While, as we saw above (p. 14), a combination of verses of the Rik for the purpose of recitation bears the name *śastra*, a similar selection of different *sámans* united into a whole is usually called *uktha* (√ *vach*, to speak), *stoma* (√ *stu*, to praise), or *prishṭha* (√ *prachh*, to ask); and these in their turn, like the *śastras*, receive different appellations.⁶³

Of special significance for the time of the composition of the Tándya Bráhmaṇa are, on the one hand, the very minute descriptions of the sacrifices on the Sarasvatí and Drishadvatí; and, on the other, the Vrátyastomas, or sacrifices by which Indians of Aryan origin, but not living according to the Brahmanical system, obtained admission to the Brahman community. The accounts of these latter sacrifices are preceded by a description of the dress and mode of life of those who are to offer them. "They drive in open chariots of war, carry bows and lances, wear turbans, robes bordered with red and having fluttering ends, shoes, and sheepskins folded double; their leaders are distinguished by brown robes and silver neck-ornaments; they pursue neither agriculture nor commerce; their laws are in a constant state of confusion; they speak the same language as those who have received Brahmanical consecration, but nevertheless call what is easily spoken hard to pronounce" This last statement probably refers to

⁶³ The term directly opposed to *śastra* is, rather, *stotra*. *Prishṭha* specially designates several *stotras* belonging to the mid-day sacrifice, and forming, as it is expressed, its "back;" *uktha* is originally employed as a synonym of *śastra*, and only at a later period in the meaning of *sáman* (*I. St.*, xiii. 447); *stoma*, lastly, is the name for the six, seven, or more ground forms of the *stotras*, after which these latter are formed for the purposes of chanting.

The simple recitation of the *śastras* by the Hotar and his companions always comes after the chanting recitation of the same verses by the

upon the varying number of the *śastras* and *stotras* belonging to their *sutyá* days. See *I. St.*, x. 353, ff., ix. 229.

prākritic, dialectic differences, to the assimilation of groups of consonants, and similar changes peculiar to the Prākṛit vernaculars. The great sacrifice of the Naimishīya-Rishis is also mentioned, and the river Sudāman. Although we have to conclude from these statements that communication with the west, particularly with the non-Brahmanic Aryans there, was still very active, and that therefore the locality of the composition must be laid more towards the west,⁶⁴ still data are not wanting which point us to the east. Thus, there is mention of Para Ātṇāra, king of the Kosalas; of Trasadasyu Purukutsa, who is also named in the Rik-Saṃhitā; further of Namin Sāpya, king of the Videhas (the Nini of the epic); of Kurukshetra, Yamunā, &c. The absence, however, of any allusion in the Tāṇḍya-Brāhmaṇa either to the Kuru-Pañchālas or to the names of their princes, as well as of any mention of Janaka, is best accounted for by supposing a difference of locality. Another possible, though less likely, explanation of the fact would be to assume that this work was contemporary with, or even anterior to, the flourishing epoch of the kingdom of the Kuru-Pañchālas. The other names quoted therein seem also to belong to an earlier age than those of the other Brāhmaṇas, and to be associated, rather, with the Rishi period. It is, moreover, a very significant fact that scarcely any differences of opinion are stated to exist amongst the various teachers. It is only against the Kaushītakis that the field is taken with some acrimony; they are denoted as *crātṃyas* (apostates) and as *yajñāvakṛtṛṇa* (unfit to sacrifice). Lastly, the name attached to this Brāhmaṇa,* viz., Tāṇḍya, is mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus as that of a teacher; so that, combining all this, we may at least safely infer its priority to the latter work.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ The fact that the name of Chitraratha (*ctena vai Chitraratham Kāpeyā ayājayan . . . tasmāch Chitrarathinām ekaḥ kshatrapatir jāyate 'nūlamba iva dvitīyah*, xx. 12, 5) occurs in the *gāṇa* 'Rājadanta' to Pāṇ., ii. 2. 31, joined with the name Bāṇlika in a compound (*Chitraratha-Bāṇlikam*), is perhaps also to be taken in this connection.

* The first use of this designation, it is true, only occurs in Lātyāyana,

the other Sūtras invariably quoting it by 'iti śruteḥ.'

⁶⁵ The Tāṇḍya-Brāhmaṇa has been edited, together with Sāyana's commentary, in the *Bibl. Ind.* (1869-74), by Anandachandra Vedāntavāgīśa. At the time of the Bhāshika-Sūtra (see Kielhorn, *J. St.*, x. 421) it must still have been accentuated, and that in the same manner as the Śatapatha; in Kumārila-bhaṭṭa's time, on the contrary (the last half of the

The *Shadviṅśa-Brāhmaṇa* by its very name proclaims itself a supplement to the *Pañchaviṅśa-Brāhmaṇa*. It forms, as it were, its twenty-sixth book, although itself consisting of several books. Sāyaṇa, when giving a summary of its contents at the commencement of his here excellent commentary, says that it both treats of such ceremonies as are not contained in the *Pañchaviṅśa-Brāhmaṇa*, and also gives points of divergence from the latter. It is chiefly expiatory sacrifices and ceremonies of imprecation that we find in it, as also short, comprehensive general rules. The fifth book (or sixth *adhyāya*) has quite a peculiar character of its own, and is also found as a separate *Brāhmaṇa* under the name of *Adbhuta-Brāhmaṇa*; in the latter form, however, with some additions at the end. It enumerates untoward occurrences of daily life, omens and portents, along with the rites to be performed to avert their evil consequences. These afford us a deep insight into the condition of civilisation of the period, which, as might have been expected, exhibits a very advanced phase. The ceremonies first given are those to be observed on the occurrence of vexatious events generally; then come those for cases of sickness among men and cattle, of damaged crops, losses of precious things, &c.; those to be performed in the event of earthquakes, of phenomena in the air and in the heavens, &c., of marvellous appearances on altars and on the images of the gods, of electric phenomena and the like, and of mis-carriages⁶⁶ This sort of superstition is elsewhere only treated of in the *Grihya-Sūtras*, or in the *Parīśiṣtas* (supplements); and this imparts to the last *adhyāya* of the *Shadviṅśa-Brāhmaṇa*—as the remaining contents do to the work generally—the appearance of belonging to a very modern period. And, in accordance with this, we find mention here made of Uddālaka Āruni, and other teachers, whose names are altogether unknown to the *Pañchaviṅśa-Brāhmaṇa*.—A *śloka* is cited in the course of

⁶⁶ The *Adbhuta-Brāhmaṇa* has been published by myself, text with translation, and explanatory notes, in *Zwei vedische Texte über Omina und Portenta* (1859).

the work, in which the four *yugas* are still designated by their more ancient names, and are connected with the four lunar phases, to which they evidently owe their origin, although all recollection of the fact had in later times died out.⁶⁷ This *śloka* itself we are perhaps justified in assigning to an earlier time than that of Megasthenes, who informs us of a fabulous division of the mundane ages analogous to that given in the epic. But it does not by any means follow that the *Shadvinśa-Brāhmaṇa*, in which the *śloka* is quoted, itself dates earlier than the time of Megasthenes.

The third *Brāhmaṇa* of the *Sāmaveda* bears the special title of *Chhândogya-Brāhmaṇa*, although *Chhândogya* is the common name for all *Sāman* theologians. We, however, also find it quoted, by *Śamkara*, in his commentary on the *Brahma-Sūtra*, as "*Tāṇḍinām śruti*," that is to say, under the same name that is given to the *Pañchaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa*. The two first *adhyāyas* of this *Brāhmaṇa* are still missing, and the last eight only are preserved, which also bear the special title of *Chhândogyopanishad*. This *Brāhmaṇa* is particularly distinguished by its rich store of legends regarding the gradual development of Brahmanical theology, and stands on much the same level as the *Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka* of the White Yajus with respect to opinions, as well as date, place, and the individuals mentioned. The absence in the *Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka*, as in the *Brāhmaṇa* of the White Yajus generally, of any reference to the *Naimiśīya-Rishis*, might lead us to argue the priority of the *Chhândogyopanishad* to the *Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka*. Still, the mention in the *Chhândogyopanishad* of these, as well as of the *Mahāvṛishas* and the *Gandhāras*—the latter, it is true, are set down as distant—ought perhaps only to be taken as proof of a somewhat more western origin; whereas the *Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka* belongs, as we shall hereafter see, to quite the eastern part of Hindustān. The numerous animal fables, on the contrary, and the mention of *Mahidaśa* *Aitareya*, would sooner incline me to suppose that the *Chhândogyopanishad* is more modern than the *Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka*. With regard to another allusion, in

⁶⁷ Differently Roth in his essay *Die Lehre von den vier Weltkugeln* (Tübingen, 1860).

itself of the greatest significance, it is more hazardous to venture a conjecture: I mean the mention of Kṛishṇa Devakīputra, who is instructed by Ghora Āṅgīrasa. The latter, and besides him (though not in connection with him) Kṛishṇa Āṅgīrasa, are also mentioned in the Kauśhītaki-Brāhmana; and supposing this Kṛishṇa Āṅgīrasa to be identical with Kṛishṇa Devakīputra, the allusion to him might perhaps rather be considered as a sign of priority to the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka. Still, assuming this identification to be correct, due weight must be given to the fact that the name has been altered here: instead of Āṅgīrasa, he is called Devakīputra, a form of name for which we find no analogy in any other Vedic writing excepting the Vāṇśas (genealogical tables) of the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka, and which therefore belongs, at all events, to a tolerably late period.* The significance of this allusion for the understanding of the position of Kṛishṇa at a later period is obvious. Here he is yet but a scholar, eager in the pursuit of knowledge, belonging perhaps to the military caste. He certainly must have distinguished himself in some way or other, however little we know of it, otherwise his elevation to the rank of deity, brought about by external circumstances, would be inexplicable.⁶³

The fact of the Chhāndogyaopaniṣad and the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka having in common the names Pravāhana Jai-
vali, Ushastī Chākṛāyana, Śāndilya, Satyakāma Jābāla, Uddālaka Āruṇi, Śvetaketu, and Aśvapati, makes it clear that they were as nearly as possible contemporary works; and this appears also from the generally complete identity of the seventh book of the former with the corresponding passages of the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka. What, however, is of most significance, as tending to establish a late date for

* Compare also Pāṇ, iv. 1. 159, and the names Śambūputra, Rāṇi-
yanīputra, in the Sāma-Sūtras; as
also Kātyāyanīputra, Maitrāyanī-
putra, Vātsīputra, &c., among the
Buddhists. [On these metronymic
names in putra see *J. St.*, iii 157,
485, 486, iv. 380, 435; v. 63, 64.]

⁶³ By what circumstances the ele-
vation of Kṛishṇa to the rank of
deity was brought about is as yet
obscure; though unquestionably

mythical relations to Indra, &c., are
at the root of it, see *J. St.*, xiii.
349, ff. The whole question, how-
ever, is altogether vague. Kṛishṇa-
worship proper, i.e., the sectarian
worship of Kṛishṇa as the one God,
probably attained its perfection
through the influence of Christi-
anity. See my paper, *Kṛishṇa's*
Geburtsfest, p. 316, ff. (where also
are further particulars as to the name
Devakī).

the Chhândogyanishad, is the voluminous literature, the existence of which is presupposed by the enumeration at the beginning of the ninth book. Even supposing this ninth book to be a sort of supplement (the names of Sanat-kumára and Skanda are not found elsewhere in Vedic literature; Nárada also is otherwise only mentioned in the second part of the Aitareya-Bráhmaṇa⁶⁹), there still remains the mention of the 'Atharvāṅgirasas,' as well as of the Itihásas and Puráṇas in the fifth book. Though we are not at liberty here, any more than in the corresponding passages of the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka, to understand by these last the Itihásas and Puráṇas which have actually come down to us, still we must look upon them as the forerunners of these works, which, originating in the legends and traditions connected with the songs of the Rik, and with the forms of worship, gradually extended their range, and embraced other subjects also, whether drawn from real life, or of a mythical and legendary character. Originally they found a place in the Bráhmaṇas, as well as in the other expository literature of the Vedas; but at the time of this passage of the Chhândogyanishad they had possibly already in part attained an independent form, although the commentaries,* as a rule, only refer such expressions to passages in the Bráhmaṇas themselves. The Mahá-Bhárata contains, especially in the first book, a few such Itihásas, still in a prose form; nevertheless, even these fragments so preserved to us belong, in respect both of style and of the conceptions they embody, to a much later period than the similar passages of the Bráhmaṇas. They however suffice, together with the *ślokas*, *gáthás*, &c., quoted in the Bráhmaṇas themselves, and with such works as the Bárhaddaivata, to bridge over for us the period of transition from legend to epic poetry.

We meet, moreover, in the Chhândogyanishad with one of those legal cases which are so seldom mentioned in Vedic literature, viz., the infliction of capital punishment for (denied) theft, exactly corresponding to the severe

⁶⁹ And a few times in the Atharva-Saṃhitá, as also in the Vaṇśa of the Sáma-vidhāna-Bráhmaṇa.

* Not Śaṃkara, it is true, in this

case, but Sáyana, Harisvámin, and Dvivedagaṅga in similar passages of the Śaṭapatha-Bráhmaṇa and Taittiríya-Āraṇyaka.

enactments regarding it in Manu's code. Guilt or innocence is determined by an ordeal, the carrying of a red-hot axe; this also is analogous to the decrees in Manu. We find yet another connecting link with the state of culture in Manu's time in a passage occurring also in the *Vṛihad-Araṇyaka*, viz., the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. We here meet with this doctrine for the first time, and that in a tolerably complete form; in itself, however, it must certainly be regarded as much more ancient. The circumstance that the myth of the creation in the fifth book is on the whole identical with that found at the beginning of Manu, is perhaps to be explained by regarding the latter as simply a direct imitation of the former. The tenth book, the subject of which is the soul, its seat in the body and its condition on leaving it, *i.e.*, its migration to the realm of Brahman, contains much that is of interest in this respect in connection with the above-mentioned parallel passage of the *Kaushītaky-Upanishad*, from which it differs in some particulars. Here also for the first time in the field of Vedic literature occurs the name *Rāhu*, which we may reckon among the proofs of the comparatively recent date of the *Chhándogyopanishad*.

only
doc-
yāna
he is
also in the *Śat. Br.*]; for "inhabited place," *ārdhā* is used;
single *ślokas* and *gāthās* are very often quoted.

The *Chhándogyopanishad* has been edited by Dr. Roer in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, vol. iii., along with Śamkara's commentary and a gloss on it.⁷⁰ Fr. Windischmann had previously given us several passages of it in the original, and several in translation; see also *I. St.*, i. 254-273.

The *Kenopanishad* has come down to us as the remnant of a fourth Brāhmaṇa of the *Sāmaveda*, supposed to be its ninth book.* In the colophons and in the quotations found in the commentaries, it also bears the other-

⁷⁰ In this series (1854-62) a translation also has been published by Rājendra Lāla Mitra.

* Regarding the contents of the

first eight books, Śamkara furnishes us with information in the beginning of his commentary.

wise unknown name of the *Talavakúras*.^{*} It is divided into two parts: the first, composed in *ślokas*, treats of the being of the supreme Brahman, appealing in the fourth verse to the tradition of the "earlier sages who have taught us this" as its authority. The second part contains a legend in support of the supremacy of Brahman, and here we find Umā Haimavatī, later the spouse of Śiva, acting as mediatrix between Brahman and the other gods, probably because she is imagined to be identical with Sarasvatī, or Vāch, the goddess of speech, of the creative word.†

These are the extant Brāhmaṇas of the Sāmaveda. Sāyaṇa, indeed, in his commentary on the Sāmavidhāna enumerates eight (see Müller, *Rik* i. Pref. p. xxvii): the *Praudha-* or *Muhā-Brāhmaṇa* (i.e., the *Pañchaviṃśa*), the *Shadviṃśa*, the *Sāmavidhi*, the *Ārsheya*, the *Devatādhyāya*, the *Upanishad*, the *Samhitopanishad*, and the *Vaṇśa*. The claims, however, of four of these works to the name of Brāhmaṇa, have no solid foundation. The *Ārsheya* is, as already stated, merely an *Anukramanī*, and the *Devatādhyāya* can hardly be said to be anything else; the *Vaṇśa* elsewhere always constitutes a part of the Brāhmaṇas themselves: the two latter works, moreover, can scarcely be supposed to be still in existence, which, as far as the *Vaṇśa* is concerned, is certainly very much to be regretted. The *Sāmavidhāna* also, which probably treats, like the portion of the *Lātyāyana-Sūtra* bearing the same name, of the conversion of the *richas* into *sāmans*, can hardly pass for a Brāhmaṇa.⁷¹ As to the *Samhitopanishad*, it appears

* Might not this name be traceable to the same root *tād, taṇḍ*, from which *Tāṇḍya* is derived?

† On the literature, &c., of the *Kenopanishad*, see *I. St.*, ii. 181, ff. [We have to add Roer's edition with Samkara's commentary, in *Bibliotheca Indica*, vol. viii., and his translation, *ibid.*, vol. xv.]

⁷¹ The above statements require to be corrected and supplemented in several particulars. The *Vaṇśa-Brāhmaṇa* was first edited by myself in *I. St.*, iv. 371, ff., afterwards by Burnell with Sāyaṇa's commentary (1873). The *Devatādhyāya* is not

an *Anukramanī*, but only contains some information as to the deities of the different *sāmans*, to which a few other short fragments are added. Finally, the *Sāmavidhāna-Brāhmaṇa* does not treat of the conversion of *richas* into *sāmans*; on the contrary, it is a work similar to the *Rigvidhāna*, and relates to the employment of the *sāmans* for all sorts of superstitious purposes. Both texts have likewise been edited by Burnell, with Sāyaṇa's commentaries (1873). By Kumārila, too, the number of the Brāhmaṇas of the Sāmaveda is given as eight (Müller,

to me doubtful whether Sāyana meant by it the Kenopanishad; for though the *sarvāṅga* (universality) of the Supreme Being certainly is discussed in the latter, the subject is not handled under this name, as would seem to be demanded by the analogy of the title of the Samhitopanishad of the Aitareya-Āraṇyaka as well as of the Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka. My conjecture would be that he is far more likely to have intended a work⁷² of the same title, of which there is a MS. in the British Museum (see *I. St.*, i. 42); and if so, all mention of the Kenopanishad has been omitted by him; possibly for the reason that it appears at the same time in an Atharvan-recension (differing but little, it is true), and may have been regarded by him as belonging to the Atharvan?

There is a far greater number of Sūtras to the Sāmaveda than to any of the other Vedas. We have here three Śrauta-Sūtras; a Sūtra which forms a running commentary upon the Pañchaviṃśa-Bṛāhmaṇa; five Sūtras on Metres and on the conversion of *richas* into *śāmans*; and a Grihya-Sūtra. To these must further be added other similar works of which the titles only are known to us, as well as a great mass of different Parīśiṣṭas.

Of the Śrauta-Sūtras, or Sūtras treating of the sacrificial ritual, the first is that of *Maṣaka*, which is cited in the other Sāma-Sūtras, and even by the teachers mentioned in these, sometimes as *Arśheya-Kalpa*, sometimes as *Kalpa*, and once also by Lātyāyana directly under the name of *Maṣaka*.⁷³ In the colophons it bears the name of *Kalpa-Sūtra*. This Sūtra is but a tabular enumeration of the prayers belonging to the several ceremonies of the Soma sacrifice; and these are quoted partly by their technical Sāman names, partly by their opening words. The

A. S. L., p. 345); in his time all of them were already without accents. One fact deserves to be specially noticed here, namely, that several of the teachers mentioned in the *Vaṇśa-Bṛāhmaṇa*, by their very names, point us directly to the north-west of India, e.g., Kāmboja Apamanyava, Madragā Śaunḍīyana, Sūta Aushtrākshi, Śālamkāyana, and Kanhala; see *I. St.*, iv. 378-380.

⁷² This is unquestionably correct,

since this text appears there, as well as elsewhere, in connection with the *Vaṇśa-Bṛāhmaṇa*, &c. It is not much larger than the *Devatādhya*, but has not yet been published; see *I. St.*, iv. 375.

⁷³ Lātyāyana designates *Maṣaka* as *Gārgya*. Is this name connected with the *Mārgya* of the Greeks? Lassen, *I. A. K.*, i. 130; *I. St.*, iv. 73.

mentioned also in another Sūtra, the Nidána-Sūtra; the same is the case with Dhánamjayya. Besides these, however, Látýáyana mentions a number of other teachers and schools, as, for example, his own *ácháryas*, with especial frequency; the Ársheya-Kalpa, two different Gautamas, one being distinguished by the surname *Sthavira* (a technical title, especially with the *vrikshi* (a teacher known to Kautsa, Várshaganya, Bhánditáyana, Lámakáyana, Ránáyana-putra, &c.; and in particular, the Sátyáyanins, and their work, the Sátyáyanaka, together with the Śálankáyanins, the latter of whom are well known to belong to the western part of India. Such allusions occur in the Sūtra of Látýáyana, as in the other Sūtras of the Sáma-veda, much more frequently than in the Sūtras of the other Vedas, and are in my opinion evidence of their priority to the latter. At the time of the former there still existed manifold differences of opinion, while in that of the latter a greater unity and fixedness of exegesis, of dogma, and of worship had been attained. The remaining data appear also to point to such a priority, unless we have to explain them merely from the difference of locality. The condition of the Súdras, as well as of the Nishádas, *i.e.*, the Indian aborigines, does not here appear to be one of such oppression and wretchedness as it afterwards became. It was permitted to sojourn with them (Śándilya, it is true, restricts this permission to "in the neighbourhood of their *grámas*"), and they themselves were allowed to attend in person at the ceremonies, although outside of the sacrificial ground. They are, moreover, now and then represented, though for the most part in a mean capacity, as taking an actual part on such occasions, which is not to be thought of in later times. Toleration was still a matter of necessity, for, as we likewise see, the strict Brahmanical principle was not yet recognised even among the neighbouring Aryan tribes. These, equally with the Brahmanical Indians, held in high esteem the songs and customs of their ancestors, and devoted to them quite as much study as the Brahmanical Indians did; nay, the latter now and then directly resorted to the former, and borrowed distinct ceremonies from them. This is sufficiently clear from the particulars of one ceremony of the

kind, which is embodied, not indeed in the Pañchaviñśa-Brāhmaṇa, but in the Shadviñśa-Brāhmaṇa, and which is described at full length by Lātyāyana. It is an imprecatory ceremony (called *śyena*, falcon); and this naturally suggests the idea that the ceremonial of the Atharvan, which is essentially based upon imprecations and magical expedients,—as well as the songs of the Atharvan itself,—may perhaps chiefly owe its cultivation to these western, non-Brahmanical, Aryan tribes. The general name given to these tribes by Lātyāyana (and with this Pāṇini v. 2. 21 agrees) is Vratīnas, and he further draws a distinction between their *yaudhas*, warriors, and their *arhants*, teachers. Their *anúchānas*, i.e., those versed in Scripture, are to be chosen priests for the above-mentioned sacrifice. Śāṇḍilya limits this to the *arhants* alone, which latter word—subsequently, as is well known, employed exclusively as a Buddhistic title—is also used in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus, and in the Āraṇyaka of the Black Yajus, to express a teacher in general. The turban and garments of these priests should be red (*lohita*) according to Shadviñśa and Lātyāyana; and we find the same colour assigned to the sacrificial robes of the priests of the Rākshasas in Laṅkā, in the Rāmāyaṇa, vi. 19. 110, 51. 21; with which may be compared the light red, yellowish red (*kashāya*) garments of the Buddhists (see for instance Mrichhakat., pp. 112, 114, ed. Stenzler; M.-Bhār., xii. 566, 11898; Yājñav., i. 272), and the red (*rakta*) dress of the Sāṃkhyabhikṣhu * in the Laghujātaka of Varāha-Mihira. Now, that these western non-Brahmanical Vratīyas, Vratīnas, were put precisely upon a par with the eastern non-Brahmanical, i.e., Buddhistic, teachers, appears from an addition which is given by Lātyāyana to the description of the Vratīyastomas as found in the Pañchaviñśa-Brāhmaṇa. We are there told that the converted Vratīyas, i.e., those who have entered into the Brahman community, must, in order to cut off all connection with their past, hand over their wealth to those of their companions who still abide by the old mode of life—thereby transferring to these their own former impurity—or else, to a “Brahma-

* According to the commentary; or should this be Śākyabhikṣhu? See I. St., ii. 287.

bandhu Mágadhadeśíya." This latter expression is only explicable if we assume that Buddhism, with its anti-Brahmanical tendencies, was at the time flourishing in Magadha; and the absence of any such allusion in the Pañchaviñśa-Bráhmaṇa is significant as to the time which elapsed between this work and the Sūtra of Látyáyana.*

The first seven *prapáthakas* of the Látyáyana-Sūtra comprise the rules common to all Soma sacrifices; the eighth and part of the ninth book treat, on the contrary, of the separate *ekáhas*; the remainder of the ninth book, of the *akinas*; and the tenth, of the *sattras*. We have an excellent commentary on it by Agnisvámin,⁷⁶ who belongs probably to the same period as the other commentators whose names terminate in *svámin*, as Bhavasvámin, Bharatasvámin, Dhúrtaśvámin, Harisvámin, Khadirasvámin, Meghasvámin, Skandasvámin, Kshirasvámin, &c; ; their time, however, is as yet undetermined.⁷⁷

The third Sāma-Sūtra, that of *Dráhyáyana*, differs but slightly from the Látyáyana-Sūtra. It belongs to the school of the Rāṇáyaníyas. We meet with the name of these latter in the Rāṇáyaníputra of Látyáyana; his family is descended from Vasishtha, for which reason this Sūtra is also directly called *Vásishṭha-Sūtra*. For the name *Dráhyáyana* nothing analogous can be adduced⁷⁸ The difference between this Sūtra and that of Látyáyana

* In the Rik-Samhitá, where the Kíkatas—the ancient name of the people of Magadha—and their king Pramaganda are mentioned as hostile, we have probably to think of the aborigines of the country, and not of hostile Áryas (?). It seems not impossible that the native inhabitants, being particularly vigorous, retained more influence in Magadha than elsewhere, even after the country had been brahmanised,—a process which perhaps was never completely effected;—that they joined the community of the Brahmana as Kshatriyas, as happened elsewhere also; and that this is how we have to account for the special sympathy and success which Buddhism met with in Magadha, these native inha-

bitants regarding it as a means of recovering their old position though under a new form.

⁷⁶ We now possess in the *Bibl. Indica* (1870-72) an edition of the Látyáyana-Sūtra, with Agnisvámin's commentary, by Anandachandra Vedántaváḡśa.

⁷⁷ We find quite a cluster of Brahman names in *-svámin* in an inscription dated Śáka 627 in *Journal Bombay Branch R. A. S.*, iii. 208 (1851), and in an undated inscription in *Journal Am. Or. Soc.*, vi 589.

⁷⁸ It first occurs in the *Vaśá-Bráhmaṇa*, whose first list of teachers probably refers to this very school; see *I. St.*, iv. 378: *draha* is said to be a Prákrít corruption of *hrada*; see Hem. Prákr., ii 80, 120.

the obscure passages of the Pañchaviñśa-Brāhmaṇa, and, it would appear, of the Shaḍviñśa-Brāhmaṇa also, accompanying the text step by step. It has not as yet been closely examined; but it promises to prove a rich mine of material for the history of Brahmanical theology, as it makes mention of, and appeals to, an extremely large number of different works. For example, of schools of the Rik, it cites the Aitareyins, the Paingins, the Kaushītaka; of schools of the Yajus, the Adhvaryus in general; further, the Śātyāyanins, Khādāyanins, the Taittirīyas, the Kāthaka, the Kālabavins, Bhāllavins, Śāmbuvis, Vājasaneyins; and frequently also *śruti*, *smṛiti*, *āchāryas*, &c. It is a work which deserves to be very thoroughly studied.⁸⁰

While the above-named four Sūtras of the Sāmaveda specially attach themselves to the Pañchaviñśa-Brāhmaṇa, the Sūtras now to be mentioned stand out more independently beside the latter, although of course, in part at least, often referring to it. In the first place, we have to mention the *Nidāna-Sūtra*, which contains in ten *prapāthakas* metrical and other similar investigations on the different *ulthas*, *stomas*, and *gānas*. The name of the author is not given. The word *nidāna*, 'root,' is used with reference to metre in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus;⁸¹ and though in the two instances where the *Nidānas* are mentioned by Yāska, their activity appears to have been directed less to the study of metre than to that of roots, etymology, still the *Nidānasamjñaka Grantha* is found cited in the *Bṛihaddevatā*, 5. 5, either directly as the Śruti of the Chhandogas, or at least as containing their Śruti.* This Sūtra is especially remarkable for the great number of Vedic schools and teachers whose various opinions it adduces; and in this respect it stands on pretty much the same level as the *Anupada-Sūtra*. It differs from it, however, by its particularly frequent quotation

⁸⁰ Unfortunately we do not even now know of more than one MS; see *I St.*, i. 43. or *yo rā atrā 'gnir gdyatṛi sa nidd-nena*)

⁸¹ This is wrong; on the contrary, the word has quite a general meaning in the passages in question (e.g., in *gdyatṛi rā eśhā niddnena*,

* *Nidāna* is the name of the

... 11, 29, 11, 404, 11.

also of the views of the Sáman theologians named by Látýáyana and Dráhyáyana, viz., Dhánamjaya, Sándilya, Śauchiśrikshi, &c.—a thing which seldom or never occurs in the former. The animosity to the Kaushítakis, with which we have already become acquainted in the Pañchaviṃśa-Brahmana, is here again exhibited most vividly in some words attributed to Dhánamjaya. With regard to the Rigveda, the *daśatayí* division into ten *maṇḍalas* is mentioned, as in Yáska. The allusion to the Átharvānikas, as well as to the Anubrahmanins, is particularly to be remarked; the latter peculiar name is not met with elsewhere, except in Pāṇini. A special study of this Sūtra is also much to be desired, as it likewise promises to open up a wealth of information regarding the condition of literature at that period.⁸²

Not much information of this sort is to be expected from the *Pushpa-Sūtra* of Gobhila,* which has to be named along with the Nidāna-Sūtra. The understanding of this Sūtra is, moreover, obstructed by many difficulties. For not only does it cite the technical names of the *sámans*, as well as other words, in a very curtailed form, it also makes use of a number of grammatical and other technical terms, which, although often agreeing with the corresponding ones in the Prátiśákhya-Sūtras, are yet also often formed in quite a peculiar fashion, here and there, indeed, quite after the algebraic type so favoured by Pāṇini. This is particularly the case in the first four *prapáthakas*; and it is precisely for these that, up to the present time at least, no commentary has been found; whereas for the remaining six we possess a very good commentary by Upádhyāya Ajátaśatru.† The work treats of the modes in which the separate *richas*, by various insertions, &c., are transformed into *sámans*, or “made to blossom,” as it were, which is evidently the origin of the name *Pushpa-Sūtra*, or “Flower-Sūtra.” In addition to

⁸² See *I. St.*, i. 41, ff.; the first two *paṭalas*, which have special reference to metre, have been edited and translated by me in *I. St.*, viii. 85-124. For Anubrahmanin, °na, see also Áśv. Śr., ii. 8. 11, and Schol. on T. S., i. 8. 1.

* So, at least, the author is called in the colophons of two chapters in MS. Chambers 220 [Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., p. 76].

† Composed for his pupil, Vish-nuśaśas.

the Pravachana, i.e. (according to the commentary), Bráhmaṇa, of the Kálavavins and that of the Śátyáyanins, I found, on a cursory inspection, mention also of the Kau-thumas. This is the first time that their name appears in a work connected with Vedic literature. Some portions of the work, particularly in the last books, are composed in ślokas, and we have, doubtless, to regard it as a compilation of pieces belonging to different-periods.⁸³ In close connection with it stands the *Sáma-Tantra*, composed in the same manner, and equally unintelligible without a commentary. It treats, in thirteen *prapáthakas*, of accent and the accentuation of the separate verses. A commentary on it is indeed extant, but at present only in a fragmentary form. At its close the work is denoted as the *vyākaraṇa*, grammar, of the *Sáman* theologians.⁸⁴

Several other Sūtras also treat of the conversion of *richas* into *sámans*, &c. One of these, the *Pañchavidhi-Sūtra* (*Pi* only known to me from well as from its name, *his* (modes) by which this process is effected. Upon a second, the *Pratihára-Sūtra*, which is ascribed to Kátyáyana, a commentary called *Daśatayí* was composed by Varadarāja, the above-mentioned commentator of Maśaka. It treats of the aforesaid five *vidhis*, with particular regard to the one called *pratihára*. The *Taṇḍálakshaṇa-Sūtra* is only known to me by name, as also the *Upagrantha-Sūtra*,* both of which, with the two other works just named, are, according to the catalogue, found in the Fort-William

⁸³ In Dekhan MSS. the work is

tram,' by which he explains the word *ukthártha*, which, according to the *Mahábháshya*, is at the foundation of *aukthika*, whose formation is taught by Pápiní himself (iv. 2. 60); see *J. St.*, xiii. 447. According to this it certainly seems very doubtful whether the *Sámalakshana* mentioned by Kaiyata is to be identified with the extant work bearing the same name.

* *Shadguruśiṣhya*, in the introduction to his commentary on the *Anukramaní* of the *Rik*, describes Kátyáyana as '*upagranthasya lá-raka*.'

lam des Hala (1870), pp. 258, 259. I now possess a copy of the text and commentary, but have nothing of consequence to add to the above remarks.

⁸⁴ See also Burnell, *Catalogue*, pp. 40, 41 — *Ibid.*, p. 44, we find a '*Svaraparibhāṣā*, or *Sámalakshana*,' specified. Kaiyata also mentions a '*sámalakshanaṃ prátīśikhyam śa-*

collection of MSS. By the anonymous transcriber of the Berlin MS. of the Maṣaka-Sūtra, who is of course a very weak authority, ten Śrauta-Sūtras for the Sāmaveda are enumerated at the close of the MS., viz., besides Lātyāyana, Anupada, Nidāna, Kalpa, Taṇḍalakshaṇa, Pañchavidheya and the Upagranthas, also the *Kalpānupada*, *Anustotra*, and the *Kshudras*. What is to be understood by the three last names must for the present remain undecided.⁸⁵

The *Grihya-Sūtra* of the Sāmaveda belongs to Gobhila, the same to whom we also found a Śrauta-Sūtra and the Pushpa-Sūtra ascribed.⁸⁶ His name has a very unvedic ring, and nothing in any way corresponding to it appears in the rest of Vedic literature.⁸⁷ In what relation this work, drawn up in four *prapāṭhakas*, stands to the Grihya-Sūtras of the remaining Vedas has not yet been investigated.⁸⁸ A supplement (*pariśiṣṭa*) to it is the *Karma-pradīpa* of Kātyāyana. In its introductory words it expressly acknowledges itself to be such a supplement to Gobhila; but it has also been regarded both as a second Grihya-Sūtra and as a Smṛiti-Śāstra. According to the statement of Āśārka, the commentator of this Karma-pradīpa, the Grihya-Sutra of Gobhila is authoritative for both the schools of the Sāmaveda, the Kauthumas as well as the Rāṇāyanīyas.*—Is the *Khādīra-Grihya*, which is now and then mentioned, also to be classed with the Sāmaveda?⁸⁹

⁸⁵ On the Pañchavidhi-Sūtra and the Kalpānupada, each in two *prapāṭhakas*, and the Kshaudra, in three *prapāṭhakas*, see Müller, *A. S. L.*, p. 210; Aufrecht, *Catalogus*, p. 377^b. The Upagrantha-Sūtra treats of expiations, *prāyaścittas*, see Rājendra L. M., *Notices of Sanskrit MSS.*, ii. 182.

⁸⁶ To him is also ascribed a Naiḡeya-Sūtra, "a description of the Metres of the Sāmaveda," see Colin Browning, *Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. existing in Oude* (1873), p. 4.

⁸⁷ A list of teachers belonging to the Gobhila school is contained in the *Vaṁśa-Brahmaṇa*.

⁸⁸ An edition of the Gobhila-Grihya-Sūtra, with a very diffuse commentary by the editor, Chan-

drakānta Tarkālamkāra, has been commenced in the *Bibl. Indica* (1871); the fourth *fasciculus* (1873) reaches to ii. 8. 12. See the sections relating to nuptial ceremonies in Haas's paper, *I. St.*, v. 283, ff.

* Among the authors of the Smṛiti-Śāstras a Kuṭhumi is also mentioned.

⁸⁹ Certainly. In Burnell's *Catalogue*, p. 56, the Drāhyāyana-Grihya-Sūtra (in four *paṭalas*) is attributed to Khādīra. Rudraskandasvāmin composed a *vṛtti* on this work also (see p. 80); and Vānīana is named as the author of '*kārikās* to the Grihya-Sūtras of Khādīra,' Burnell, p. 57. To the Grihya-Sūtras of the Sāmaveda probably belong also Gautama's *Pitṛmedha-Sūtra*

As representative of the last stage of the literature of the Sāmaveda, we may specify, on the one hand, the various *Paddhatis* (outlines) and commentaries, &c., which connect themselves with the Sūtras, and serve as an explanation and further development of them; and, on the other, that peculiar class of short treatises bearing the name of *Parīśiṣṭas*, which are of a somewhat more independent character than the former, and are to be looked upon more as supplements to the Sūtras*. Among these, the already mentioned *Arsha* and *Daivata*—enumerations of the Rishis and deities—of the Samhitā in the Nageya-Śākhā deserve prominent notice. Both of these treatises refer throughout to a comparatively ancient tradition; for example, to the Nairuktas, headed by Yāska and Śākapūṇi, to the Naighantukas, to Śaunaka (i.e. probably to his Anukramanī of the Rik), to their own Brāhmaṇa, to Aitareya and the Aitareyins, to the Śatapathikas, to the Pravachana Kāthaka, and to Āśvalāyana. The *Dālhbhya-Parīśiṣṭa* ought probably also to be mentioned here; it bears the name of an individual who appears several times in the Chhāndogyaopaniṣad, but particularly often in the Tūraṇas, as one of the sages who conduct the dialogue.

The *Yajurveda*, to which we now turn, is distinguished above the other Vedas by the great number of different schools which belong to it. This is at once a consequence and a proof of the fact that it became pre-eminently the subject of study, inasmuch as it contains the formulas for the entire sacrificial ceremonial, and indeed forms its

(cf. Burnell, p. 57; the commentator Anantayajvan identifies the author with Akṣhapāda, the author of the Nyāya Sūtra), and the *Gautama-Dharma-Sūtra*; see the section treating of the legal literature.

* Rāmakaṣha, in his commen-

tary on the Grihya-Sūtra of the White Yajus, several times ascribes their authorship to a Kātyāyana (India Office Library, No. 440, fol. 52*, 56*, 58*, &c.); or do these quotations only refer to the above-named Karmapradīpa?

this very fact of the Black Yajus being made up of *khaṇḍas*, fragments, although Pāṇini,* as in the case of Taittirīya, traces it to a Rishi of the name of Khandika, and although we do really meet with a Khandika (Audbhāri) in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus (xi. 8. 4. 1).

Of the many schools which are allotted to the Black Yajus, all probably did not extend to Samhitā and Brāhmaṇa; some probably embraced the Sūtras only.† Thus far, at least, only three different recensions of the Samhitā are directly known to us, two of them in the text itself, the third merely from an Anukramaṇī of the text. The two first are the *Taittirīya-Samhitā*, κατ' ἐξοχὴν so called, which is ascribed to the school of Āpastamba, a subdivision of the Khāṇḍikīyas; and the *Kāṭhaka*, which belongs to the school of the Charakas, and that particular subdivision of it which bears the name of Chārāyaṇīyas.‡ The Samhitā, &c., of the Ātreya school, a subdivision of the Aukhīyas, is only known to us by its Anukramaṇī; it agrees in essentials with that of Āpastamba. This is not the case with the Kāṭhaka, which stands on a more independent footing, and occupies a kind of intermediate position between the Black and the White Yajus, agreeing frequently with the latter as to the readings, and with the former in the arrangement of the matter. The Kāṭhaka, together with the *Hāridravika*—a lost work, which, however, likewise certainly belonged to the Black Yajus, viz., to the school of the Hāridravīyas, a subdivision of the Maitrāyaṇīyas—is the only work of the Brāhmaṇa order mentioned by name in Yāska's Nirukta. Pāṇini, too, makes direct reference to it in a rule, and it is further alluded to in the Anupada-Sūtra and Brihaddevatā. The name of the Kāṭhas does not appear in other Vedic writings, nor does that of Āpastamba.§

* The rule is the same as that for Tittiri. The remark in the previous note, therefore, applies here also.

† As is likewise the case with the other Vedas.

‡ Besides the text, we have also a Rishyanukramaṇī for it.

§ In later writings several Kāṭhas are distinguished, the Kāṭhas, the Prāchya-Kāṭhas, and the Kapish-

thala-Kāṭhas; the epithet of these last is found in Pāṇini (viii. 3. 91), and Megasthenes mentions the Καμψιθοδοί as a people in the Panjab—In the Fort-William Catalogue a Kapishthala-Samhitā is mentioned [see *J. St.*, xiii. 375, 439.—At the time of the Mahābhāshya the position of the Kāṭhas must have been one of great consideration, since

The Samhitá of the Ápastamba school consists of seven books (called *ashṭakas* !); these again are divided into 44 *praśnas*, 651 *anurákas*, and 2198 *kandikás*, the latter being separated from one another on the principle of an equal number of syllables to each.⁹⁰ Nothing definite can be ascertained as to the extent of the Átreya recension; it is likewise divided into *kándas*, *praśnas*, and *anurákas*, the first words of which coincide mostly with those of the corresponding sections of the Ápastamba school. The Káthaka is quite differently divided, and consists of five parts, of which the three first are in their turn divided into forty *sthánakas*, and a multitude of small sections (also probably separated according to the number of words); while the fourth merely specifies the *richas* to be sung by the Hotar, and the fifth contains the formulas belonging to the horse-sacrifice. In the colophons to the three first parts, the Charaka-Śákhá is called *Iṭhimiká*, *Madhyamiká*, and *Orimiká*, respectively: the first and last of these three appellations are still unexplained.⁹¹ The Bráhmaṇa portion in these works is extremely meagre as regards the ritual, and gives but an imperfect picture of it; it is, however, peculiarly rich in legends of a mythological character. The sacrificial formulas themselves are on the whole the same as those contained in the Samhitá of the White Yajus; but the order is different, although the

they—and their text, the Káthaka—are repeatedly mentioned; see *I. St.*, xiii. 437, ff. The founder of their school, Kátha, appears in the Mahábháshya as Vaiśampáyaṇa's pupil, and the Kathas themselves appear in close connection with the Kálápas and Kauthumás, both schools of the Sāman. In the Rámáyana, too, the Kátha-Kálápas are mentioned as being much esteemed in Ayodhyá (ii. 32. 18, Schlegel). Haradatta's statement, "*Bahyrichánam apyasti Káthaśákhá*" (Bhaṭṭojí's *Siddh. Kaum.* ed. Táránátha (1865), vol. ii p. 524, on Pán., vii. 4. 38), probably rests upon some misunderstanding; see *I. St.*, xiii. 438.]

⁹⁰ It is not the number of syllables, but the number of words, that

constitutes the norm; fifty words, as a rule, form a *kandiká*; see *I. St.*, xi. 13, xii. 90, xiii. 97-99. Instead of *ashṭaka*, we find also the more correct name *lāṇḍa*, and instead of *praśna*, which is peculiar to the Taittiríya texts, the generally employed term, *prapathaka*; see *I. St.*, xi. 13, 124. The Taitt. Bráhm. and the Taitt. Ár., are also subdivided into *kandikás*, and these again into very small sections; but the principle of these divisions has not yet been clearly ascertained.

⁹¹ *Iṭhimiká* is to be derived from *heṭhima* (from *heṭhā*, i.e., *adhasād*), and *Orimiká* from *uarima* (from *uparī*); see my paper, *Über die Bhagavati der Jaina*, i. 404, n.

this very fact of the Black Yajus being made up of *khaṇḍas*, fragments, although Pāṇini,* as in the case of Taittirīya, traces it to a Rishi of the name of Khaṇḍika, and although we do really meet with a Khaṇḍika (Audbhāri) in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus (xi. 8. 4. 1).

Of the many schools which are allotted to the Black Yajus, all probably did not extend to Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa; some probably embraced the Sūtras only.† Thus far, at least, only three different recensions of the Saṃhitā are directly known to us, two of them in the text itself, the third merely from an Anukramaṇī of the text. The two first are the *Taittirīya-Saṃhitā*, κατ' ἐξοχὴν so called, which is ascribed to the school of Āpastamba, a subdivision of the Khāṇḍikīyas; and the *Kāthaka*, which belongs to the school of the Charakas, and that particular subdivision of it which bears the name of Chārāyaṇīyas.‡ The Saṃhitā, &c., of the Ātreya school, a subdivision of the Aukhīyas, is only known to us by its Anukramaṇī; it agrees in essentials with that of Āpastamba. This is not the case with the Kāthaka, which stands on a more independent footing, and occupies a kind of intermediate position between the Black and the White Yajus, agreeing frequently with the latter as to the readings, and with the former in the arrangement of the matter. The Kāthaka, together with the *Hāridravika*—a lost work, which, however, likewise certainly belonged to the Black Yajus, viz., to the school of the Hāridravīyas, a subdivision of the Maitrāyaṇīyas—is the only work of the Brāhmaṇa order mentioned by name in Yāska's Nirukta. Pāṇini, too, makes direct reference to it in a rule, and it is further alluded to in the Anupada-Sūtra and Brihaddevatā. The name of the Kāthas does not appear in other Vedic writings, nor does that of Āpastamba.§

* The rule is the same as that for Tittiri. The remark in the previous note, therefore, applies here also.

† As is likewise the case with the other Vedas.

‡ Besides the text, we have also a Rishyanukramaṇī for it.

§ In later writings several Kāthas are distinguished, the Kāthas, the Prāchya-Kāthas, and the Kapish-

thala-Kāthas; the epithet of these last is found in Pāṇini (viii. 3. 91), and Megasthenes mentions the *Καυβισθολοι* as a people in the Panjāb—In the Fort-William Catalogue a Kapishthala-Saṃhitā is mentioned [see *I. St.*, xiii. 375, 439.—At the time of the Mahābhāṣya the position of the Kāthas must have been one of great consideration, since

The Samhitá of the Ápastamba school consists of seven books (called *ashtakas* !); these again are divided into 44 *práśnas*, 651 *anurákas*, and 2198 *kaṇḍikás*, the latter being separated from one another on the principle of an equal number of syllables to each.⁹⁰ Nothing definite can be ascertained as to the extent of the Átreya recension; it is likewise divided into *káandas*, *práśnas*, and *anurákas*, the first words of which coincide mostly with those of the corresponding sections of the Ápastamba school. The Káthaka is quite differently divided, and consists of five parts, of which the three first are in their turn divided into forty *sthánakas*, and a multitude of small sections (also probably separated according to the number of words); while the fourth merely specifies the *richas* to be sung by the Hotar, and the fifth contains the formulas belonging to the horse-sacrifice. In the colophons to the three first parts, the Charaka-Śákhá is called *Iṭhimiká*, *Madhyamiká*, and *Orimiká*, respectively: the first and last of these three appellations are still unexplained.⁹¹ The Bráhmāna portion in these works is extremely meagre as regards the ritual, and gives but an imperfect picture of it; it is, however, peculiarly rich in legends of a mythological character. The sacrificial formulas themselves are on the whole the same as those contained in the Samhitá of the White Yajus; but the order is different, although the

they—and their text, the Káthaka—are repeatedly mentioned; see *I. St.*, xiii. 437, ff. The founder of their school, Kátha, appears in the Mahábháshya as Vaiśampáya's pupil, and the Káthas themselves appear in close connection with the Kálápas and Kanthumas, both schools of the Sáman. In the Rámáyana, too, the Kátha-Kálápas are mentioned as being much esteemed in Ayodhyá (ii. 32. 18, Schlegel). Haradatta's statement, "*Bahvrichānam apyasti Kaṣṭhāśākhā*" (Dhattoji's Siddh. Kaum. ed. Tāradāthi (1865), vol. ii. p. 524, on Pán., vii. 4. 38), probably rests upon some misunderstanding; see *I. St.*, xiii. 438.]

⁹⁰ It is not the number of syllables, but the number of words, that

constitutes the norm; fifty words, as a rule, form a *kaṇḍiká*, see *I. St.*, xi. 13, xii. 90, xiii. 97-99.—Instead of *ashtaka*, we find also the more correct name *kaṇḍa*, and instead of *práśna*, which is peculiar to the Taittiriya texts, the generally employed term, *prapāṭhaka*; see *I. St.*, xi. 13, 124.—The Taitt. Bráhm. and the Taitt. Ár., are also subdivided into *kaṇḍikas*, and these again into very small sections; but the principle of these divisions has not yet been clearly ascertained.

⁹¹ *Iṭhimiká* is to be derived from *heṣṭhuma* (from *heṣṭhā*, i.e., *adhasād*), and *Orimiká* from *utarima* (from *upari*); see my paper, *Ueber die Bhagarati der Jaina*, i. 404, n.

order of the ceremonial to which they belong is pretty much the same. There are also many discrepancies with regard to the words; we may instance, in particular, the expansion of the semi-vowels *v* and *y* after a consonant into *uv* and *iy*, which is peculiar to the Āpastamba school.⁹² As to data, geographical or historical, &c. (here, of course, I can only speak of the Āpastamba school and the Kāthaka), in consequence of the identity of matter these are essentially the same as those which meet us in the Samhitā of the White Yajus. (In the latter, however, they are more numerous, formulas being also found here for ceremonies which are not known in the former—the *purushamedha*, for instance.) Now these data—to which we must add some other scattered allusions* in the portions bearing the character of a Brāhmaṇa—carry us back, as we shall see, to the flourishing epoch of the kingdom of the Kuru-Pañchālas,⁹³ in which district we must therefore recognise the place of origin of both works. Whether this also holds good of their final redaction is another question, the answer to which, as far as the Āpastamba-Samhitā is concerned, naturally depends upon the amount of influence in its arrangement to be ascribed to Āpastamba, whose name it bears. The Kāthaka, according to what has been stated above, appears to have existed as an entirely finished work even in Yāska's time, since he quotes it; the Anukramanī of the Ātreya school, on the contrary, makes Yāska Paṇḍitī⁹⁴ (as the pupil of Vaiśampāyana) the teacher of Tittiri, the latter again the in-

⁹² For further particulars, see *I. St.*, xiii. 104–106.

* Amongst them, for example, the enumeration of the whole of the lunar asterisms in the Āpastamba-Samhitā, where they appear in an order deviating from that of the later series, which, as I have pointed out above (p. 30), must necessarily have been fixed between 1472 and 536 B.C. But all that follows from this, in regard to the passage in question, is that it is not earlier than 1472 B.C., which is a matter of course; it nowise follows that it may not be later than 536 B.C. So we obtain nothing definite here.

[This remains correct, though the position of the case itself is somewhat different; see the notes above, p. 2 and p. 30. In connection with the enumeration of the Nakshatras, compare especially my essay, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakshatra*, ii. 299, ff.]

⁹³ Of peculiar interest is the mention of Dhṛitarāshṭra Vaichitravīrya, as also of the contests between the Pañchālas and the Kuntis in the Kāthaka; see *I. St.*, iii. 469–472.

⁹⁴ Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Miśra, on the contrary, gives Yājñavalka instead of Paṇḍitī; see Burnell's *Catalogue*, p. 14.

structor of Ukha, and Ukha the preceptor of Ātreya.* This at least clearly exhibits its author's view of the priority of Yāska to the schools and redactions of the Black Yajus bearing the names of Tittiri and Ātreya; although the data necessary to prove the correctness of this view are wanting. That, however, some sort of influence in the arrangement of the Samhitā of the Black Yajus is certainly to be attributed to Yāska, is evident further from the fact that Bhatta Bhāskara Miśra, in an extant fragment of his commentary on the Āpastamba-Samhitā,† quotes, side by side with the views of Kāśakṛitsna and Ekachūrni regarding a division of the text, the opinion of Yāska also.

Along with the Kāthaka, the Mānava and the Maitra are very frequently quoted in the commentaries on the Kāṭiya-Sūtra of the White Yajus. We do not, it is true, find these names in the Sūtras or similar works; but at all events they are meant for works resembling the Kāthaka, as is shown by the quotations themselves, which are often of considerable length. Indeed, we also find, although only in later writings, the Maitrāyaṇīyas, and, as a subdivision of these, the Mānavas, mentioned as schools of the Black Yajus. Possibly these works may still be in existence in India.‡

* *See I. St.*, xiii. 351.] with Śāyana's complete commentary, was commenced by Roer (1854), continued by Cowell and Rāma Nārāyana, and is now in the hands of

† *See I. St.*, xiii. 351.]

‡ We have, besides, a commentary, by Śāyana, though it is only fragmentary; another is ascribed to a Bālakṛishna [In Burnell's Collection of MSS., see his *Catalogue*, pp. 12-14, is found the greater portion of Bhatta Kauśika Bhāskara Miśra's commentary, under the name *Jñānayaṇa*; the author is said to have lived 400 years before Śāyana; he quotes amongst others Bhāvasāmuni, and seems to stand in special connection with the Ātreya school. A *Paiśchabhāshya* on the Black Yajus is also mentioned; see *I. St.*, ix. 176.—An edition of the Taittiriya-Samhitā in the *Bibl. Indica*,

myself in *I. St.*, xi., xii. (1871-72). On the Kāthaka, see *I. St.*, iii. 451-479.]

‡ According to the Fort-William Catalogue, the 'Maitrāyaṇī-Śākhā' is in existence there. [Other MSS. have since been found; see Haug in *I. St.*, ix. 175, and his essay *Brahma und die Brahmanen*, pp. 31-34 (1875) and R. Nārāyana's *Detached*...

sists at present of five *lāṇḍas*, two of which, however, are but later ad-

Besides the Samhitá so called, there is a Bráhmaṇa recognised by the school of Āpastamba, and also by that of Ātreya,* which, however, as I have already remarked, differs from the Samhitá, not as to the nature of its contents, but only in point of time; it is, in fact, to be regarded merely as a supplement to it. It either reproduces the formulas contained in the Samhitá, and connects them with their proper ritual, or it develops further the liturgical rules already given there; or again, it adds to these entirely new rules, as, for instance, those concerning the *purushamedha*, which is altogether wanting in the Samhitá, and those referring to the sacrifices to the lunar asterisms. Only the third and last book, in twelve *prapāṭhakas*, together with Sáyana's commentary, is at present known.⁹⁵ The three last *prapāṭhakas*, which contain four different sections, relating to the manner of preparing certain peculiarly sacred sacrificial fires, are ascribed in the Anukramanī of the Ātreya school (and this is also confirmed by Sáyana in another place) to the sage Kātha. Two other sections also belong to it, which, it seems, are only found in the Ātreya school, and not in that of Āpastamba; and also, lastly, the two first books of the Taittiriya-Araṇyaka, to be mentioned presently. Together these eight sections evidently form a supplement to the Kāthaka above discussed; they do not, however, appear to exist as an independent work, but only in connection with the Bráhmaṇa and Araṇyaka of the Āpastamba- (and Ātreya-) schools, from which, for the rest, they can be externally distinguished easily enough by the absence of the expansion of *v* and *y* into *uv* and *iy*. The legend quoted towards the end of the second of these sections (*prap.* xi. 8), as to the visit of Nachiketas, to the lower

ditions, viz., the Upanishad (see below), which passes as *kāṇḍa* ii., and the last *kāṇḍa*, called Khila.]

* At least as regards the fact, for the designation Samhitá or Bráhmaṇa does not occur in its Anukramanī. On the contrary, it passes without any break from the portions which belong in the Āpastamba school to the Samhitá, to those there belonging to the Bráhmaṇa.

⁹⁵ All three books have been

edited, with Sáyana's commentary, in the *Bibl. Ind.* (1855-70), by Rājendra Lalla Mitra. The Hiranya-keśisákhya-Bráhmaṇa quoted by Bühler, *Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. from Gujarat*, i. 38, is not likely to depart much from the ordinary Āpastamba text; the respective Śrauta-Sūtras at least agree almost literally with each other; see Bühler, *Āpastambiya-dharmasūtra*, Preface, p. 6 (1868).

world, gave rise to an Upanishad of the Atharvan which bears the name of Káthakopanishad. Now, between this supplement to the Káthaka and the Káthaka itself a considerable space of time must have elapsed, as follows from the allusions made in the last sections to Mahá-Meru, Krauñcha, Mainága; to Vaiśampáyana, Vyása Páráśarya, &c.; as well as from the literature therein presupposed as existing, the 'Atharváṅgirasas,' Bráhmaṇas, Itihásas, Puráṇas, Kalpas, Gáthás, and Náráyaṇís being enumerated as subjects of study (*svádhyáya*). Further, the last but one of these sections is ascribed to another author, viz, to the Aruṇas, or to Áruna, whom the scholiast on Páṇini⁹⁶ speaks of as a pupil of Vaiśampáyana, a statement with which its mention of the latter as an authority tallies excellently; this section is perhaps therefore only erroneously assigned to the school of the Kathas.—The *Taittiríya-Áranyaka*, at the head of which that section stands (as already remarked), and which belongs both to the Ápastamba and Átreya schools, must at all events be regarded as only a later supplement to their Bráhmaṇa, and belongs, like most of the Áranyakas, to the extreme end of the Vedic period. It consists of ten books, the first six of which are of a liturgical character: the first and third books relate to the manner of preparing certain sacred sacrificial fires; the second to preparatives to the study of Scripture; and the fourth, fifth, and sixth to purificatory sacrifices and those to the Manes, corresponding to the last books of the Samhitá of the White Yajus. The last four books of the Áranyaka, on the contrary, contain two Upanishads; viz, the seventh, eighth, and ninth books, the *Taittiríyopanishad*, κατ' ἑξοχὴν so called, and the tenth, the *Yájñikí-* or *Náráyaṇíyá-Upanishad*. The former, or *Taittiríyopanishad*, is in three parts. The first is the *Samhitopanishad*, or *Śikshávallí*,* which begins with a short grammatical disquisition,⁹⁷ and then turns to

⁹⁶ Kaiyata on Páṇi, 'iv. 2. 104 (Mahábháshya, fol. 73^b, ed. Benares), he calls him, however, Arun instead of Aruṇa, and derives from him the school of the Arunins (cited in the Bháshya, *ibid*); the Arunis are cited in the Káthaka itself; see *I. St.*, in. 475.

* Vallí means 'a creeper;' it is perhaps meant to describe these Upanishads as 'creepers,' which have attached themselves to the Veda-Śákhá.

⁹⁷ See above, p. 61; Muller, *A. S. L.*, p. 113, ff; Haug, *Ueber das Wesen des vedischen Accents*, p. 54.

the question of the unity of the world-spirit. The second and third are the *Anandavallī* and *Bhṛigu Vallī*, which together also go by the name of *Vārūṇī-Upanishad*, and treat of the bliss of entire absorption in meditation upon the Supreme Spirit, and its identity with the individual soul.* If in these we have already a thoroughly systematised form of speculation, we are carried even further in one portion of the Yājñikī-Upanishad, where we have to do with a kind of sectarian worship of Nārāyaṇa: the remaining part contains ritual supplements. Now, interesting as this whole Āraṇyaka is from its motley contents and evident piecing together of collected fragments of all sorts, it is from another point of view also of special importance for us, from the fact that its tenth book is actually extant in a double recension, viz., in a text which, according to Śāyaṇa's statements, belongs to the Drāviḍas, and in another, bearing the name of the Āndhras, both names of peoples in the south-west of India. Besides these two texts, Śāyaṇa also mentions a recension belonging to the Karnāṭakas, and another whose name he does not give. Lastly, this tenth book† exists also as an Atharvopaniṣad, and here again with many variations; so that there is here opened up to criticism an ample field for researches and conjectures. Such, certainly, have not been wanting in Indian literary history; it is seldom, however, that the facts lie so ready to hand as we have them in this case, and this we owe to Śāyaṇa's commentary, which is here really excellent.

When we look about us for the other Brāhmaṇas of the Black Yajus, we find, in the first place, among the schools

* See a translation, &c., of the Taitt. Upanishad in *I. St.*, ii. 207-235. It has been edited, with Śaṃkara's commentary, by Roer in *Bibl. Indica*, vol. vii. [; the text alone, as a portion of the Taitt. Ār., by Rājendra Lāla Mitra also, see next note. Roer's translation appeared in vol. xv. of the *Bibliotheca Indica*].

† See a partial translation of it in *I. St.*, ii. 78-100. [It is published in the complete edition of the Taitt. Āraṇyaka, with Śāyaṇa's commentary thereon (excepting books

vii.-ix., see the previous note), in *Bibl. Ind.* (1864-72), by Rājendra Lāla Mitra; the text is the Drāviḍa text commented upon by Śāyaṇa, in sixty-four *anuvākas*, the various readings of the Āndhra text (in eighty *anuvākas*) being also added. In Burnell's collection there is also a commentary on the Taitt. Ār., by Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Miśra, which, like that on the Saṃhitā, is entitled *Jñānayajna*; see Burnell's *Catalogue*, pp. 16, 17.]

cited in the Sāma-Sūtras two which must probably be considered as belonging to the Black Yajus, viz., the *Bhāllavins* and the *Śātyāyanins*. The Brāhmana of the *Bhāllavins* is quoted by the scholiast on Pānini, probably following the Mahābhāshya,⁹⁸ as one of the 'old' Brāhmanas: we find it mentioned in the Brihaddevatā; Sureśvarāchārya also, and even Sāyaṇa himself, quote passages from the Bhāllaviśruti. A passage supposed to be borrowed from the Bhāllavi-Upanishad is adduced by the sect of the Mādhyas in support of the correctness of their (Dvaita) belief (*As Res*, xvi. 104). That the Bhāllavins belong to the Black Yajus is, however, still uncertain; I only conclude so at present from the fact that Bhāllaveya is the name of a teacher specially attacked and censured in the Brāhmana of the White Yajus. As to the *Śātyāyanins*, whose Brāhmana is also reckoned among the 'old' ones by the scholiast on Pānini,⁹⁹ and is frequently quoted, especially by Sāyaṇa, it is pretty certain that they belong to the Black Yajus, as it is so stated in the Charanavyūha, a modern index of the different schools of the Vedas, and, moreover, a teacher named Śātyāyani is twice mentioned in the Brāhmana of the White Yajus. The special regard paid to them in the Sāma-Sūtras, and which, to judge from the quotations, they themselves paid to the Sāman, is probably to be explained by the peculiar connection (itself still obscure) which we find elsewhere also between the schools of the Black Yajus and those of the Sāman.¹⁰⁰ Thus, the Kāthas are mentioned along with the Sāman schools

⁹⁸ This is not so, for in the Bhāshya to the particular *sūtra* of Pāp. (iv. 3. 105), the Bhāllavins are not mentioned. They are, however, mentioned elsewhere in the work, at iv. 2. 104 (here Kuyata derives them from a teacher Bhāllu: Bhāllunā *molam adhyate*); as a *Bhāllaveya Matsya rājaputra* is cited in the Anupada, vi. 5, their home may have been in the country of the Matsyas; see *I. St.*, xiii. 441, 442. At the time of the Bhāshika-Sūtra their Brāhmana text was still accentuated, in the same way as the Śātapatha; see Kielhorn, *I. St.*, x. 421.

⁹⁹ The Mahābhāshya is not his au-

thority in this case either, for it does not mention the Śātyāyanins in its comment on the *sūtra* in question (iv. 3. 105). But Kaiyaṣa cites the Brāhmanas proclaimed by Śātyāyana, &c., as contemporaneous with the Yājñavalkya Brāhmanāni and Saulabhanī Br., which are mentioned in the Mahābhāshya (see, however, *I. St.*, v. 67, 68); and the Mahābhāshya itself cites the Śātyāyanins along with the Bhāllavins (on iv. 2. 104); they belonged, it would seem, to the north; see *I. St.*, xiii. 442.

¹⁰⁰ See on this *I. St.*, iii. 473, xiii. 439.

the question of the unity of the world-spirit. The second and third are the *Anandavallī* and *Bhṛiguvallī*, which together also go by the name of *Vārūṇī-Upanishad*, and treat of the bliss of entire absorption in meditation upon the Supreme Spirit, and its identity with the individual soul.* If in these we have already a thoroughly systematised form of speculation, we are carried even further in one portion of the *Yājñikī-Upanishad*, where we have to do with a kind of sectarian worship of *Nārāyaṇa*: the remaining part contains ritual supplements. Now, interesting as this whole *Āraṇyaka* is from its motley contents and evident piecing together of collected fragments of all sorts, it is from another point of view also of special importance for us, from the fact that its tenth book is actually extant in a double recension, viz., in a text which, according to *Sāyaṇa*'s statements, belongs to the *Drāviḍas*, and in another, bearing the name of the *Āndhras*, both names of peoples in the south-west of India. Besides these two texts, *Sāyaṇa* also mentions a recension belonging to the *Karṇāṭakas*, and another whose name he does not give. Lastly, this tenth book† exists also as an *Atharvopaniṣad*, and here again with many variations; so that there is here opened up to criticism an ample field for researches and conjectures. Such, certainly, have not been wanting in Indian literary history; it is seldom, however, that the facts lie so ready to hand as we have them in this case, and this we owe to *Sāyaṇa*'s commentary, which is here really excellent.

When we look about us for the other *Brāhmaṇas* of the Black *Yajus*, we find, in the first place, among the schools

* See a translation, &c., of the *Taitt. Upanishad* in *I. St.*, ii. 207-235. It has been edited, with *Samkara*'s commentary, by Roer in *Bibl. Indica*, vol. vii. [; the text alone, as a portion of the *Taitt. Ar.*, by *Rājendra Lāla Mitra* also, see next note. Roer's translation appeared in vol. xv. of the *Bibliotheca Indica*].

† See a partial translation of it in *I. St.*, ii. 78-100. [It is published in the complete edition of the *Taitt. Aranyaka*, with *Sāyaṇa*'s commentary thereon (excepting books

vii.-ix., see the previous note), in *Bibl. Ind.* (1864-72), by *Rājendra Lāla Mitra*; the text is the *Drāviḍa* text commented upon by *Sāyaṇa*, in sixty-four *anuvākas*, the various readings of the *Āndhra* text (in eighty *anuvākas*) being also added. In *Burnell*'s collection there is also a commentary on the *Taitt. Ar.*, by *Bhaṭṭa Bhāṣkara Miśra*, which, like that on the *Sambitā*, is entitled *Jñānayajña*; see *Burnell's Catalogue*, pp. 16, 17.]

cited in the Sāma-Sūtras two which must probably be considered as belonging to the Black Yajus, viz., the *Bhāllavins* and the *Śātyāyanins*. The Brāhmaṇa of the *Bhāllavins* is quoted by the scholiast on Pāṇini, probably following the Mahābhāṣya,⁹⁸ as one of the 'old' Brāhmaṇas: we find it mentioned in the Bṛhaddevatā; Suresvarāchārya also, and even Sāyaṇa himself, quote passages from the Bhāllaviśruti. A passage supposed to be borrowed from the Bhāllavi-Upaniṣad is adduced by the sect of the Mādhavas in support of the correctness of their (Dvaita) belief (*As. Res.*, xvi. 104). That the Bhāllavins belong to the Black Yajus is, however, still uncertain, I only conclude so at present from the fact that Bhāllaveya is the name of a teacher specially attacked and censured in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus. As to the *Śātyāyanins*, whose Brāhmaṇa is also reckoned among the 'old' ones by the scholiast on Pāṇini,⁹⁹ and is frequently quoted, especially by Sāyaṇa, it is pretty certain that they belong to the Black Yajus, as it is so stated in the Charanavyūha, a modern index of the different schools of the Vedas, and, moreover, a teacher named Śātyāyani is twice mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus. The special regard paid to them in the Sāma-Sūtras, and which, to judge from the quotations, they themselves paid to the Sāman, is probably to be explained by the peculiar connection (itself still obscure) which we find elsewhere also between the schools of the Black Yajus and those of the Sāman.¹⁰⁰ Thus, the Kathas are mentioned along with the Sāman schools

⁹⁸ This is not so, for in the Bhāṣya to the particular *sūtra* of Pān. (iv. 3. 105), the Bhāllavins are not mentioned. They are, however, mentioned elsewhere in the work, at iv. 2. 104 (here Kaiyata derives them from a teacher Bhallu: *Bhallund proklam adhyate*); as a *Bhallaveya Matsya vijayputrah* is cited in the Anupada, vi. 5, their home may have been in the country of the Matsyas; see *I. St.*, xiii. 441, 442. At the time of the Bhāṣhika-Sūtra their Brāhmaṇa text was still accentuated, in the same way as the Śātapatha; see Kielhorn, *I. St.*, x. 421.

⁹⁹ The Mahābhāṣya is not his au-

Brāhmaṇas proclaimed by Śātyā-

See on this *I. St.*, iii. 473, xiii.

439.

of the Kálápas and Kauthumas; and along with the latter the Laukákṣhas also. As to the Śákāyanins,* Sáyakāyanins, Kálabavins, and Śálanākāyanins,¹⁰¹ with whom, as with the Śátyāyanins, we are only acquainted through quotations, it is altogether uncertain whether they belong to the Black Yajus or not. The *Chhagalins*, whose name seems to be borne by a tolerably ancient Upanishad in Anquetil's *Oupnekhat*, are stated in the Charaṇavyúha¹⁰² to form a school of the Black Yajus (according to Pāṇini, iv. 3. 109, they are called Chháḡaleyins): the same is there said of the *Śvetáśvataras*. The latter gave their name to an Upanishad composed in a metrical form, and called at its close the work of a Śvetáśvatara: in which the Sámkhya doctrine of the two primeval principles is mixed up with the Yoga doctrine of one Lord, a strange misuse being here made of wholly irrelevant passages of the Samhitá, &c., of the Yajus; and upon this rests its sole claim to be connected with the latter. Kapila, the originator of the Sámkhya system, appears in it raised to divine dignity itself, and it evidently belongs to a very late period; for though several passages from it are quoted in the Brahma-Sútra of Bádaráyaṇa (from which its priority to the latter at least would appear to follow), they may just as well have been borrowed from the common source, the Yajus. It is, at all events, a good deal older than Śamkara, since he regarded it as Śruti, and commented upon it. It has recently been published, together with this commentary,* by Dr. Roer, in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, vol. vii.; see also *Ind. Stud.*, i. 420, ff.—The *Maitráyaṇa Upanishad* at least bears a more ancient name, and might perhaps be connected

* They are mentioned in the tenth book of the Bráhmaṇa of the White Yajus [see also Káṭhaka 22. 7, *I. St.*, iii. 472]; as is also Sáyakāyana.

¹⁰¹ The Śálanākāyanas are ranked as Bráhmaṇas among the Váhiḱas in the Calcutta scholium to Pān. v. 3. 114 (*bhāṣhye na vyākhyātam*). Vyāsa's mother, Satyavatí, is called Śálanākāyanajā, and Pāṇini himself Śálanāki; see *I. St.*, xiii. 375, 395, 428, 429.

¹⁰² This statement needs correc-

tion to this extent, that the Charaṇavyúha does not know the name Chhagalin at all (which is mentioned by Pāṇini alone), but speaks only of Chháḡeyas or Chháḡaleyas; see *I. St.*, iii. 258; Müller, *A. S. L.*, p. 370. On Anquetil's 'Tschakli' Upanishad see now *I. St.*, ix. 42-46.

* Distinguished by a great number of sometimes tolerably long quotations from the Purāṇas, &c. [Roer's translation was published in the *Bibl. Ind.*, vol. xv.]

with the above-mentioned Maitra (Brāhmaṇa). Its text, however, both in language and contents, shows that, compared with the latter, it is of a very modern date. At present, unfortunately, I have at my command only the four first *prapāṭhakas*, and these in a very incorrect form,*—whereas in Anquetil's translation, the Upanishad consists of twenty chapters,—yet even these are sufficient clearly to determine the character of the work. King Brihadraṭha, who, penetrated by the nothingness of earthly things, resigned the sovereignty into the hands of his son, and devoted himself to contemplation, is there instructed by Śākāyanya (see *gaṇa* 'Kuñja') upon the relation of the *ātman* (soul) to the world; Śākāyanya communicates to him what Maitreya had said upon this subject, who in his turn had only repeated the instruction given to the Bāla-khilyas by Prajāpati himself. The doctrine in question is thus derived at third hand only, and we have to recognise in this tradition a consciousness of the late origin of this form of it. This late origin manifests itself externally also in the fact that sources are quoted with the doctrine, introduced *apy uktam*, "at্রে 'মে কব্ৰসাঁয়ানাসতুলিহ." The ideas themselves are quite upon a level with those of the fully developed Sāṃkhya doctrine,† and the language is completely marked off from the

* I obtained them quite recently, in transcript, through the kindness of Baron d'Eckstein, of Paris, to-

to the commentary, on the one hand, the two last books are to be considered as *kūlas*, and on the other, the whole Upanishad belongs to a *puralāṇḍa*, in four books, of ritual purport, by which most likely

raṇya often mentioned by Colebrooke. [It is really so; and this portion has since been published, together with the Upanishad in full, by Cowell, in his edition of the Maitr. Upanishad, in seven *prapāṭhakas*, with Rāmātirtha's commentary and an English translation, in the *Bibl. Ind.* (1862-70). According

to the commentary, on the one hand, the two last books are to be considered as *kūlas*, and on the other, the whole Upanishad belongs to a *puralāṇḍa*, in four books, of ritual purport, by which most likely

† Brahman, Rudra, and Vishṇu represent respectively the Sattva, the Tamas, and the Rajas elements of Prajāpati.

present, the doctrine of this Upanishad stands in close connection with the opinions of the Buddhists,¹⁰⁵ although from its Brahmanical origin it is naturally altogether free from the dogma and mythology peculiar to Buddhism. We may here also notice, especially, the contempt for writing (*grantha*) exhibited in one of the *śloka*s* quoted in corroboration.

Neither the Chhagalins, nor the Śvetāśvataras, nor the Maitrāyaṇīyas are mentioned in the Sūtras of the other Vedas, or in similar works, as schools of the Black Yajus; still, we must certainly ascribe to the last mentioned a very active share in its development, and the names Maitreya and Maitreyī at least are not unfrequently quoted in the Brāhmaṇas.

In the case of the Sūtras, too, belonging to the Black Yajus, the large number of different schools is very striking. Although, as in the case of the Brāhmaṇas, we only know the greater part of them through quotations, there is reason to expect, not only that the remarkably rich collection of the India House (with which I am only very superficially acquainted) will be found to contain many treasures in this department, but also that many of them will yet be recovered in India itself. The Berlin collection does not contain a single one. In the first place, as to the Śrauta-Sūtras, my only knowledge of the *Kaṭha-Sūtra*,† the *Manu-Sūtra*, the *Maṭra-Sūtra*, and the *Laugākshi-Sūtra* is derived from the commentaries on the Kāṭīya-Sūtra of the White Yajus; the second, however,¹⁰⁶ stands in the catalogue of the Fort-William col-

¹⁰⁵ Bāṇa's Harshacharitra informs us of a Maitrāyaṇīya Divākara who embraced the Buddhist creed; and Bhāu Dāj (Journal Bombay Branch R. A. S., x 40) adds that even now Maitr. Brahmins live near Bhadrāgān at the foot of the Vindhya, with whom other Brahmins do not eat in common; 'the reason may have been the early Buddhist tendencies of many of them.'

* Which, by the way, recurs together with some others in precisely the same form in the Anṛitavindu- (or Brahmanavindu-) Upanishad [Though it may be very doubtful

whether the word *grantha* ought really *a priori* and for the earlier period to be understood of written texts (cf. *I. St.*, xii. 476), yet in this verse, at any rate, a different interpretation is hardly possible; see below.]

† Laugākshi and the '*Lamādyānindm Brdhmaṇam*' are said to be quoted therein.

¹⁰⁶ On this, as well as on the contents and the division of the work, see my remarks in *I. St.*, v. 13-16, in accordance with communications received from Professor Cowell; cf. also Haug, *ibid.*, ix. 175 A Mānava

present, the doctrine of this Upanishad stands in close connection with the opinions of the Buddhists,¹⁰⁵ although from its Brahmanical origin it is naturally altogether free from the dogma and mythology peculiar to Buddhism. We may here also notice, especially, the contempt for writing (*grantha*) exhibited in one of the *Slokas** quoted in corroboration.

Neither the Chhagalins, nor the Śvetāśvataras, nor the Maitráyaṇīyas are mentioned in the Sūtras of the other Vedas, or in similar works, as schools of the Black Yajus; still, we must certainly ascribe to the last mentioned a very active share in its development, and the names Maitreya and Maitreyī at least are not unfrequently quoted in the Brāhmaṇas.

In the case of the Sūtras, too, belonging to the Black Yajus, the large number of different schools is very striking. Although, as in the case of the Brāhmaṇas, we only know the greater part of them through quotations, there is reason to expect, not only that the remarkably rich collection of the India House (with which I am only very superficially acquainted) will be found to contain many treasures in this department, but also that many of them will yet be recovered in India itself. The Berlin collection does not contain a single one. In the first place, as to the Śrauta-Sūtras, my only knowledge of the *Kaṭha-Sūtra*,† the *Manu-Sūtra*, the *Maitra-Sūtra*, and the *Laugākshi-Sūtra* is derived from the commentaries on the Kāṭīya-Sūtra of the White Yajus; the second, however,¹⁰⁶ stands in the catalogue of the Fort-William col-

¹⁰⁵ Bīna's Harshacharitra informs us of a Maitráyaṇīya Divākara who embraced the Buddhist creed; and Bhāu Dājl (*Journal Bombay Branch R. A. S.*, x 40) adds that even now Maitra Brahmins live near Bhadrān at the foot of the Vindhya, with whom other Brahmins do not eat in common; 'the reason may have been the early Buddhist tendencies of many of them.'

* Which, by the way, recurs together with some others in precisely the same form in the Anuṣṭavindu- (or Brahmanindu-) Upanishad [Though it may be very doubtful

whether the word *grantha* ought really *a priori* and for the earlier period to be understood of written texts (cf. *I. St.*, xii. 476), yet in this verse, at any rate, a different interpretation is hardly possible; see below.]

† Laugākshi and the '*Lamaldya-nindam Brāhmaṇam*' are said to be quoted therein.

¹⁰⁶ On this, as well as on the contents and the division of the work, see my remarks in *I. St.*, v. 13-16, in accordance with communications received from Professor Cowell; cf. also Haug, *ibid.*, ix. 175. A Mānava

lection, and of the last, whose author is cited in the *Kātha-Sūtra*, as well as in the *Kāṭiya-Sūtra*, there is, it appears, a copy in Vienna. Mahādeva, a commentator of the *Kalpa-Sūtra* of Satyāśhādha Hiranyakeśi, when enumerating the *Taittirīya-Sūtras* in successive order in his introduction, leaves out these four altogether, and names at the head of his list the *Sūtra* of *Baudhāyana* as the oldest, then that of *Bhāradvāja*, next that of *Āpastamba*, next that of *Hiranyakeśi* himself, and finally two names not otherwise mentioned in this connection, *Vādhlāna* and *Vaikhānasa*, the former of which is perhaps a corrupted form. Of these names, *Bhāradvāja* is the only one to be found in Vedic works; it appears in the *Brāhmaṇa* of the White Yajus, especially in the supplements to the *Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka* (where several persons of this name are mentioned), in the *Kāṭiya-Sūtra* of the same Yajus, in the *Prātiśākhya-Sūtra* of the Black Yajus, and in *Pāṇini*. Though the name is a patronymic, yet it is possible that these last citations refer to one and the same person, in which case he must at the same time be regarded as the founder of a grammatical school, that of the *Bhāradvājīyas*. As yet, I have seen nothing of his *Sūtra*, and am acquainted with it only through quotations. According to a statement by the Mahādeva just mentioned, it treats of the oblation to the Manes, in two *prāśnas*, and therefore shares with the rest of the *Sūtras* this designation of the sections, which is peculiar to the Black Yajus.¹⁰⁷ The *Sūtra* of *Āpastamba** is found in the Library of the India House, and a part of it in Paris also. Commentaries on it by

Śrauta-Sūtra is also cited in Bühler's *Catalogue of MSS. from Gujardt*, i. 188 (1871); it is in 322 foll. The manuscript edited in facsimile by Goldstücker under the title, '*Mānava Kalpa-Sūtra, being a portion of this ancient work on Vaidik rites, together with the Commentary of Kumārilaśvāmin*' (1861), gives but little of the text, the commentary quoting only the first words of the passages commented upon; whether the concluding words, '*Kumārelabdhāṣyaṃ samāptaṃ*,' really indicate that

Kumārilaśvāmin was the author of the commentary seems still doubtful.

¹⁰⁷ The *Bhāradvājīya-Sūtra* has now been discovered by Bühler; see his *Catal. of MSS. from Guj.*, i. 186 (212 foll.); the *Vaikhānasa-Sūtra* is also quoted, *ib.* i. 190 (292 foll.); see also Haug in *I. St.*, ix. 175.

* According to the quotations, the *Vājasaneyaka*, *Bahvrīcha-Brāhmaṇa*, and *Sātyāyanaka* are frequently mentioned therein.

Dhūrtasvāmin and Tālavrintanivāsin are mentioned,¹⁰³ also one on the Sūtra of Baudhāyana by Kapardisvāmin.¹⁰⁹ The work of Satyāśhādha contains, according to Mahādeva's statement,¹¹⁰ twenty-seven *prāśnas*, whose contents agree pretty closely with the order followed in the Kāṭiya-Sūtra; only the last nine form an exception, and are quite peculiar to it. The nineteenth and twentieth *prāśnas* refer to domestic ceremonies, which usually find a place in the Grihya- and Smārta-Sūtras. In the twenty-first, genealogical accounts and lists are contained; as also in a *prāśna* of the Baudhāyana-Sūtra.*

Still scantier is the information we possess upon the *Grihya-Sūtras* of the Black Yajus. The *Kāṭhaka* Grihya-Sūtra is known to me only through quotations, as are also the Sūtras of *Baudhāyana* (extant in the Fort-William

¹⁰³ On the Āpastamba-Śrauta-Sūtra and the commentaries belonging to it, by Dhūrtasv., Kapardisvāmin, Rudradatta, Gurudevāsāmīn, Karavindasvāmin, Tālav., Ahobalasūri (Adablla in Buhler, *l. c.*, p. 150, who also mentions a Nṛsiṃha, p. 152), and others, see Burnell in his *Catalogue*, pp. 18-24, and in the *Indian Antiquary*, 15, 6. According to this the work consists of thirty *prāśnas*; the first twenty-three treat of the sacrificial rites in essentially the same order (from *darīpārṇa-māsau* to *sattrāyanam*) as in Hiran-yakeśi, whose Sūtra generally is almost identical with that of Āpastamba; see Buhler's preface to the Āp. Dharma-Sūtra, p. 6; the 24th *prāśna* contains the general rules, *paribhāṣā*, edited by M. Muller in *Z. D. M. G.*, ix. (1855), a *pravara-lhaṇḍa* and a *hautraka*; *prāśnas* 25-27 contain the Grihya-Sūtra; *prāśnas* 28, 29, the Dharma-Sūtra, edited by Buhler (1868); and finally, *prāśna* 30, the Śulva-Sūtra (*śulva*, 'measuring cord').

¹⁰⁹ On the Baudhāyana-Sūtra compare likewise Burnell's *Catalogue*, pp. 24-30. Bhavasvāmin, who amongst others commented it, is mentioned by Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara, and is consequently placed by Burnell (p. 26) in

the eighth century. According to Kielhorn, *Catalogue of S. MSS. in the South Division of the Bombay Pres.*, p. 8, there exists a commentary on it by Śāyan also, for whom, indeed, it constituted the special text-book of the Yajus school to which he belonged, see Burnell, *Vaṇsa-Brahmana*, pp. ix-xix. In Buhler's *Catalogue of MSS. from Guy*, i. 182, 184, Anantadēva, Navabasta, and Śeṣha are also quoted as scholiasts. The exact compass of the entire work is not yet ascertained; the Baudhāyana-Dharma-Sūtra, which, according to Bühler, *Digest of Hindu Law*, i. p. xxi (1867), forms part of the Śrauta-Sūtra, as in the case of Āpastamba and Hiran-yakeśi, was commented by Govindasvāmin; see Burnell, p. 35.

¹¹⁰ Māṭṛidatta and Vāñcheśvara (?) are also mentioned as commentators; see Kielhorn, *l. c.*, p. 10.

* Such lists are also found in Āśvalāyana's work, at the end, though only in brief; for the Kāṭiya-Sūtra, a *Parīśiṣṭa* comes in. [*Prāśnas* 26, 27, of Hiran-yakeśi treat of *dharma*s, so that here also, as in the case of Āpast. and Baudh., the Dharma-Sūtra forms part of the Śrauta-Sūtra.]

collection), of *Bhāradvāja*, and of *Satyāśhādha*, or *Hiranyakeśi*, unless in this latter case only the corresponding *prāśnas* of the Kalpa-Sūtra are intended.¹¹¹ I have myself only glanced through a Paddhati of the Gṛihya-Sūtra of the *Maitrāyaṇīya* school, which treats of the usual subject (the sixteen *samskāras*, or sacraments). I conclude that there must also have been a Gṛihya-Sūtra¹¹² of the *Mānava* school, from the existence of the Code bearing that name,¹¹³ just as the Codes ascribed to Atri, Āpastamba, Chhāgaleya, Baudhāyana, Laugākshi, and Sātyāyana are probably to be traced to the schools of the same name belonging to the Black Yajus, that is to say, to their Gṛihya-Sūtras.¹¹⁴

Lastly, the *Prātiśākhya-Sūtra* has still to be mentioned as a Sūtra of the Black Yajus. The only manuscript with which I am acquainted unfortunately only begins at the fourth section of the first of the two *prāśnas*. This work is of special significance from the number of very peculiar names of teachers * mentioned in it: as Ātreya, Kaundinya (once by the title of Sthavira), and Bhāradvāja, whom we know already; also Vālmīki, a name which in this connection is especially surprising; and further Āgniveśya, Āgniveśyāyana, Paushkarasādi, and others. The two last names, as well as that of Kaundinya,† are mentioned in Buddhist writings as the names either of pupils or of contemporaries of Buddha, and Paushkarasādi is also cited in the *vārttikas* to Pāṇini by Kātyāyana, their author. Again, the allusion occurring here for the first time to the Mīmāṃsakas and Taittirīyakas deserves to be remarked:

¹¹¹ This is really so. On Āpastamba- and Bhāradvāja-Gṛihya, see Burnell, *Catalogue*, pp. 30-33. The sections of two '*prayogas*,' of both texts, relating to birth ceremonial, have been edited by Speijer in his book *De Ceremonia apud Indos quæ vocatur jātakarma* (Leyden, 1872).

¹¹² It is actually extant; see Bühler, *Catalogue*, i. 188 (80 foll.), and Kielhorn, *l. c.*, p. 10 (fragment).

¹¹³ Johāntgen in his valuable tract *Ueber das Gesetzbuch des Manu* (1863), p. 109, ff., has, from the geographical data in Manu, ii. 17, ff., fixed the territory between the Dri-

shadvatī and Sarasvatī as the proper home of the Mānavas. This appears somewhat too strict. At any rate, the statements as to the extent of the Madhyadeśa which are found in the Pratiṣṭhā-Pariśiṣṭa of the White Yajus point us for the latter more to the east; see my essay *Ueber das Pratiṣṭhā-Sūtra* (1872), pp. 101, 105.

¹¹⁴ See Johāntgen, *l. c.*, p. 108, 109.

* Their number is twenty; see Roth, *Zur Litt. und Gesch.*, pp. 65, 66.

† See *I. St.*, i. 441 not. [xiii. 387, ff., 418].

also the contradistinction, found at the close of the work, of *Chhandas* and *Bhāshā*, i.e., of Vedic and ordinary language.¹¹⁵ The work appears also to extend to a portion of the *Āraṇyaka* of the Black Yajus; whether to the whole cannot yet be ascertained, and is scarcely probable.¹¹⁶

In conclusion, I have to notice the two *Anukramanī*s already mentioned, the one belonging to the *Ātreya* school, the other to the *Chārāyaṇīya* school of the *Kāthaka*. The former¹¹⁷ deals almost exclusively with the contents of the several sections, which it gives in their order. It consists of two parts. The first, which is in prose, is a mere nomenclature; the second, in thirty-four *śloka*s, is little more. It, however, gives a few particulars besides as to the transmission of the text. To it is annexed a commentary upon both parts, which names each section, together with its opening words and extent. The *Anukramanī* of the *Kāthaka* enters but little into the contents, it limits itself, on the contrary, to giving the *Rishis* of the various sections as well as of the separate verses; and here, in the case of the pieces taken from the *Rik*, it not unfrequently exhibits considerable divergence from the statements given in the *Anukramanī* of the latter, citing, in particular, a number of entirely new names. According to the concluding statement, it is the work of *Atri*, who imparted it to *Laugākshi*.

We now turn to the *White Yajus*.

With regard, in the first place, to the name itself, it probably refers, as has been already remarked, to the fact that the sacrificial formulas are here separated from their

¹¹⁵ In the passage in question (xxiv. 5), '*chhandobhāshā*' means rather 'the Veda language;' see Whitney, p. 417.

¹¹⁶ We have now an excellent edition of the work by Whitney, *Journal Am. Or. Soc.*, ix. (1871), text, translation, and notes, together with a commentary called *Tribhāshya-ratna*, by an anonymous author (or is his name *Kārttikeya*?), a compilation from three older commentaries by *Ātreya*, *Mādhishya*, and *Vararuchi*.—No reference to the *Taitt.*

Ar. or *Taitt. Brāhm* is made in the text itself; on the contrary, it confines itself exclusively to the *Taitt. S*. The commentary, however, in some few instances goes beyond the *T. S.*; see Whitney's special discussion of the points here involved, pp 422-426; cf. also *I. St.*, iv. 76-79.

¹¹⁷ See *I. St.*, iii. 373-401, xii. 350-357, and the similar statements from *Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Miśra* in *Burnell's Catalogue*, p. 14. The *Ātreya* text here appears in a special relation to a *śrautarata yajña*.

ritual basis and dogmatical explanation, and that we have here a systematic and orderly distribution of the matter so confusedly mixed up in the Black Yajus. This is the way in which the expression *śuklāni yajūnshi* is explained by the commentator Dviveda Gaṅga, in the only passage where up till now it has been found in this sense, namely, in the last supplement added to the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka of the White Yajus. I say in the only passage, for though it appears once under the form *śukrayajūnshi*, in the Āraṇyaka of the Black Yajus (5. 10), it has hardly the same general meaning there, but probably refers, on the contrary, to the fourth and fifth books of that Āraṇyaka itself. For in the Anukramanī of the Ātreya school these books bear the name *śukriyakāṇḍa*, because referring to expiatory ceremonies; and this name *śukriya*, 'expiating' [probably rather 'illuminating' ?] belongs also to the corresponding parts of the Saṃhitā of the White Yajus, and even to the *sāmans* employed at these particular sacrifices.

Another name of the White Yajus is derived from the surname Vājasaneyā, which is given to Yājñavalkya, the teacher who is recognised as its author, in the supplement to the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka, just mentioned. Mahīdhara, at the commencement of his commentary on the Saṃhitā of the White Yajus, explains Vājasaneyā as a patronymic, "the son of Vājasani." Whether this be correct, or whether the word *vājasani* is to be taken as an appellative, it at any rate signifies * "the giver of food," and refers to the chief object lying at the root of all sacrificial ceremonies, the obtaining of the necessary food from the gods whom the sacrifices are to propitiate. To this is also to be traced the name *vājīn*, "having food," by which the theologians of the White Yajus are occasionally distinguished.¹¹⁸ Now, from Vājasaneyā are derived two forms of words by which the Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus are found

* In Mahā-Bhārata, xii. 1507, the word is an epithet of Kṛishṇa. [Here also it is explained as above; for the Rik, however, according to the St. Petersburg Dictionary, we have to assign to it the meaning of 'procuring courage or strength, victorious, gaining booty or prize.' The explanation of the word *vāja*

by 'food' (*anna*) is probably purely a scholastic one.]

¹¹⁸ According to another explanation, this is because the Sun as Horse revealed to Yājñavalkya the *ayātayāmasamjñāni yajūnshi*; see Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, iii. 5: 28; 'swift, courageous, horse,' are the fundamental meanings of the word:

cited, namely, *Vájasaneyaka*, first used in the Taittiriya-Sútra of Ápastamba and the Kátiya-Sútra of the White Yajus itself, and *Vájasaneyinas*,* i.e., those who study the two works in question, first used in the Anupada-Sútra of the Sámaveda.

In the White Yajus we find, what does not occur in the case of any other Veda, that Samhitá and Bráhmāna have been handed down in their entirety in two distinct recensions; and thus we obtain a measure for the mutual relations of such schools generally. These two recensions agree almost entirely in their contents, as also in the distribution of them; in the latter respect, however, there are many, although slight, discrepancies. The chief difference consists partly in actual variants in the sacrificiál formulas, as in the Bráhmāna, and partly in orthographic or orthoepic peculiarities. One of these recensions bears the name of the *Kánvas*, the other that of the *Mádhyaṃdinas*, names which have not yet been found in the Sútras or similar writings. The only exception is the Prátiśákhyā-Sútra of the White Yajus itself, where there is mention both of a *Kánva* and of the *Mádhyaṃdinas*. In the supplement to the Vṛihad-Áranyaka again, in the lists of teachers, a *Kánvíputra* (vi. 5 1) and a *Mádhyaṃdináyana* (iv. 6 2) at least are mentioned, although only in the *Kánva* recension, not in the other; the former being cited among the latest, the latter among the more recent members of the respective lists. The question now arises whether the two recensions are to be regarded as contemporary, or if one is older than the other. It is possible to adopt the latter view, and to consider the *Kánva* school as the older one. For not only is *Kánva* the name of one of the ancient Rishi families of the Rigveda—and with the Rigveda this recension agrees in the peculiar notation of the cerebral *ḍ* by *ḷ*—but the remaining literature of the White Yajus appears to connect itself rather with the school of the *Mádhyaṃdinas*. However this may be,¹¹⁹ we cannot, at

* Occurs in the *gana* 'Sāunala' [The *Vájasaneyaka* is also quoted by *Lātyáyana*.]

¹¹⁹ The *Mádhyaṃdinas* are not mentioned in Patanjali's *Mahá-bhashya*, but the *Kánvas*, the *Kán-*

vaka, a yellow (*piṅgala*) *Kánva*, and a *Kánvyáyana*, and also their pupils, are mentioned; see *I. St.*, xii 417, 444. The school of the *Kánvas* *Saunarasas* is mentioned in the *Káthaka*, see on this *I. St.*, iii. 475,

must be supplied thereto in the proper place. The ten following *adhyāyas* (xxx.—xxxix.) contain the formulas for entirely new sacrificial ceremonies, viz., the *purusha-medha* (human sacrifice),¹²³ the *sarva-medha* (universal sacrifice), the *pitri-medha* (oblation to the Manes), and the *pravargya* (purificatory sacrifice).¹²⁴ The last *adhyāya*, finally, has no sort of direct reference to the sacrificial ceremonial. It is also regarded as an Upanishad,* and is professedly designed to fix the proper mean between those exclusively engaged in sacrificial acts and those entirely neglecting them. It belongs, at all events, to a very advanced stage of speculation, as it assumes a Lord (*iś*) of the universe.†—Independently of the above-mentioned external testimony to the later origin of these fifteen *adhyāyas*, their posteriority is sufficiently proved by the relation in which they stand both to the Black Yajus and to their own Brāhmaṇa, as well as by the data they themselves contain. In the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā only those formulas appear which are found in the first eighteen *adhyāyas*, together with a few of the *mantras* belonging to the horse sacrifice; the remainder of the latter, together with the *mantras* belonging to the *sautrāmanī* and the human sacrifice, are only treated of in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa; and those for the universal and the purificatory sacrifices, as well as those for oblations to the Manes, only in the Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka. In like manner, the first eighteen *adhyāyas* are cited in full, and explained word by word in the first nine books of the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus; but only a few of the formulas for the *sautrāmanī*, the horse sacrifice, human sacrifice, universal

¹²³ See my essay, *Ueber Menschenopfer bei den Indern der vedischen Zeit*, in *J. Str.*, i. 54, ff.

¹²⁴ This translation of the word *pravargya* is not a literal one (for this see the St. Petersburg Dict., under root *varj* with prep. *pra*), but is borrowed from the sense and purpose of the ceremony in question; the latter is, according to Haug on Ait. Brāhm., i. 18, p. 42, "a preparatory rite intended for providing the sacrificer with a heavenly body, with which alone he is permitted to enter the residence of the gods."

* Other parts, too, of the Vājas. S. have in later times been looked upon as Upanishads; for example, the sixteenth book (*Sata-rudriya*), the thirty-first (*Purusha-sūkta*), thirty-second (*Tadara*), and the beginning of the thirty-fourth book (*Sīrasaṃkalpa*).

† According to Mahīdhara's commentary, its polemic is directed partially against the Bauddhas, that is, probably, against the doctrines which afterwards were called Sāṃkhya.

are to be sought more especially in the thirtieth and thirty-ninth *adhyāyas*, as compared with the sixteenth. It is, of course, only the Yajus portions proper which can here be adduced, and not the verses borrowed from the Rik-Samhitā, which naturally prove nothing in this connection. At most they can only yield a sort of measure for the time of their incorporation into the Yajus, in so far as they may be taken from the latest portions of the Rik, in which case the existence of these at that period would necessarily be presupposed. The data referred to consist in two facts. First, whereas in the sixteenth book Rudra, as the god of the blazing fire, is endowed with a large number of the epithets subsequently applied to Śiva, two very significant epithets are here wanting which are applied to him in the thirty-ninth book, viz., *īśāna* and *mahādeva*, names probably indicating some kind of sectarian worship (see above, p. 45). Secondly, the number of the mixed castes given in the thirtieth is much higher than that given in the sixteenth book. Those mentioned in the former can hardly all have been in existence at the time of the latter, or we should surely have found others specified besides those that are actually mentioned.

Of the forty books of the Samhitā, the sixteenth and thirtieth are those which bear most distinctly the stamp of the time to which they belong. The sixteenth book, on which, in its Taittirīya form, the honour was afterwards bestowed of being regarded as an Upanishad, and as the principal book of the Śiva sects, treats of the propitiation of Rudra; and (see *I. St.*, ii. 22, 24-26) by its enumeration and distinction of the many different kinds of thieves, robbers, murderers, night-brawlers, and highwaymen, his supposed servants, reveals to us a time of insecurity and violence: its mention, too, of various mixed castes indicates that the Indian caste system and polity were already fully developed. Now as, in the nature of things, these were not established without vigorous opposition from those who were thrust down into the lower castes, and as this opposition must have manifested itself chiefly in feuds, open or secret, with their oppressors, I am inclined to suppose that this Rudra book dates from the time of these secret feuds on the part of the conquered aborigines, as well as of the Vratyas or unbrahmanised Aryans, after

their open resistance had been more or less crushed.¹²⁵ At such a time, the worship of a god who passes as the pro-

dedicated at the *purusha-medha*, gives the names of most of the Indian mixed castes, whence we may at any rate conclude that the complete consolidation of the Brahmanical polity had then been effected. Some of the names here given are of peculiar interest. So, for example, the *māgadha*, who is dedicated in v. 5 "*atikrushṭāya*." The question arises, What is to be understood by *māgadha*? If we take *atikrushṭa* in the sense of "great noise," the most obvious interpretation of *māgadha* is to understand it, with Mahīdhara, in its epic sense, as signifying a minstrel,* son of a Vaiśya by a Kshatriyā. This agrees excellently with the dedications immediately following (in v. 6), of the *sūta* to the dance, and of the *śailūsha* to song, though not so well, it must be admitted, with the dedications immediately preceding, of the *klība* (eunuch), the *ayogū* (gambler?), and the *puñśchalū* (harlot). The *māgadha* again appears in their company in v. 22,† and they cannot be said to throw the best light upon his moral character, a circumstance which is certainly surprising, considering the position held by this caste in the epic; though, on the other hand, in India also, musicians, dancers, and singers (*śailūshas*) have not at any time enjoyed the best reputation. But another interpretation of the word *māgadha* is possible.‡ In the fifteenth, the

¹²⁵ By the Buddhist author Yaśomitra, scholast of the Abhidharmaśāstra, the Sātarudriya is stated to be a work by Vyāsa against Buddhism, whence, however, we have probably to conclude only that it passed for, and was used as, a principal support for Śiva worship, especially in its detached form as a separate Upanishad; see Burnouf's *Introduction à l'Histoire du Bouddhisme*, p. 568; *I. St.*, ii. 22.

* How he comes by this name is, it is true, not clear.

† Here, however, the *kitara* is put instead of the *ayogū*, and be-

sides, an express condition is laid down that the four must belong neither to the Śūdra nor to the Brāhmaṇa caste. [By *ayogū* may also be meant an unchaste woman; see *I. St.*, i. 76]

‡ Śāyana, commenting on the corresponding passage of the Taitt Brāhmaṇa (iii. 4. 1), explains the word *atikrushṭāya* by *atiniṇḍita-dardya*, "dedicated to the very Blameworthy as his deity" [in Rājendra Lāla Mitra's edition, p. 347]; this 'very Blameworthy,' it is true, might also refer to the bad moral reputation of the minstrels.

so-called Vratya book* of the Atharva-Samhitā, the Vratya (i.e., the Indian living outside of the pale of Brahmanism) is brought into very special relation to the *puṁśchalī* and the *māgadha*; faith is called his harlot, the *mītra* (friend?) his *māgadha*; and similarly the dawn, the earth (?), the lightning his harlots, the *mantra* (formula), *hasa* (scorn?), the thunder his *māgadhas*. Owing to the obscurity of the Vratya book, the proper meaning of this passage is not altogether clear, and it is possible, therefore, that here also the dissolute minstrel might be intended. Still the connection set forth in the Sāma-Sūtras of Lātyāyana and Drāhyāyana, as well as in the corresponding passage of the Kāṭiya-Sūtra between the Vratyas and the *magadhadeśīya brahmabandhu*,¹²⁶ and the hatred with which the Magadhas are elsewhere (see Roth, p. 38) spoken of in the Atharva-Samhitā, both lead us to interpret the *māgadha* of the Vratya book as an heretical teacher. For the passages, also, which we are more immediately discussing, this interpretation vies with the one already given; and it seems, in particular, to be favoured by the express direction in v. 22, that "the *māgadha*, the harlot, the gambler, and the eunuch" must neither be Śūdras nor Brahmans,—an injunction which would be entirely superfluous for the *māgadha* at least, supposing him to represent a mixed caste, but which is quite appropriate if the word signifies "a native of the country Magadha." If we adopt this latter interpretation, it follows that heretical (i.e., Buddhist) opinions must have existed in Magadha at the time of the composition of this thirtieth *adhyāya*. Meanwhile, however, the question which of these two interpretations is the better one remains, of course, unsolved.—The mention of the *nakshatradarśa*, "star-gazer," in v. 10, and of the

* Translated by Aufrecht, *I. St.*, i. 130, ff. [The St. Petersburg Dict., s. v., considers 'the praise of the Vratya in Ath. xv. as an idealising of the devout vagrant or mendicant (*parivrājaka*, &c.);' the fact of his being specially connected with the *puṁśchalī* and the *māgadha* remains, nevertheless, very strange, and even with this interpretation leads us to surmise suggestions of Buddhism.]

¹²⁶ In the very same way, the

Māgadha—explained by Śaṅkara as *Magadhadeśotpanno brahmachāri*—is contemptuously introduced by the Sūtrakāra (probably Baudhāyana?) to T. S., vii. 5. 9. 4, in association with a *puṁśchalī*; see *I. St.*, xii. 330.—That there were good Brahmans also in Magadha appears from the name *Magadharāṣi*, which is given to Prātibodhisputra, the second son of Hrasva Māndūkeya, in Śāṅkh. Ār., vii. 14.

ganaka, "calculator," in v. 20, permits us, at all events, to conclude that astronomical, *i.e.*, astrological, science was then actively pursued. It is to it that, according to Mahīdhara at least, the "questions" repeatedly mentioned in v. 10 relate, although Śāyana, perhaps more correctly, thinks that they refer to the usual disputations of the Brahmans. The existence, too, of the so-called Vedic quinquennial cycle is apparent from the fact that in v. 15 (only in xxvii. 45 besides) the five names of its years are enumerated; and this supposes no inconsiderable proficiency in astronomical observation¹²⁷—A barren wife is dedicated in v. 15 to the Atharvans, by which term Śāyana understands the imprecatory and magical formulas bearing the name Atharvan; to which, therefore, one of their intended effects, barrenness, is here dedicated. If this be the correct explanation, it necessarily follows that Atharvan-songs existed at the time of the thirtieth book.—The names of the three dice in v. 18 (*kṛita*, *tretā*, and *dvāpara*) are explained by Śāyana, commenting on the corresponding passage of the Taittiriya-Brāhmaṇa, as the names of the epic *yugas*, which are identical with these—a supposition which will not hold good here, though it may, perhaps, in the case of the Taittiriya-Brāhmaṇa*—The hostile reference to the Charakāchārya in v. 18 has already been touched upon (p. 87).¹²⁸

In the earlier books there are two passages in particular which give an indication of the period from which they date. The first of these exists only in the Kāṇva recension, where it treats of the sacrifice at the consecration of a king. The text in the Mādhyamdina recension (ix. 40, x. 18) runs as follows: "This is your king, O ye So and So," where, instead of the name of the people, only the indefinite pronoun *amī* is used; whereas in the Kāṇva

¹²⁷ Since *samvatsara* is here mentioned twice, at the beginning and at the end, possibly we have here to do with a sexennial cycle even (cf. T. Br., iii. 10. 4. 1); see my paper, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakṣatra*, ii. 298 (1862). The earliest allusion to the quinquennial *yuga* occurs in the Rik itself, iii. 55. 18 (i. 25. 8).

* Where, moreover, the fourth name, *lālī*, is found, instead of the *śakanda* given here [see *J. Str.*, i. 82].

¹²⁸ Śāyana on T. Br., iii. 4. 16, p. 361, explains (!) the word by 'teacher of the art of dancing on the point of a bamboo'; but the *vaśānartin* is introduced separately in v. 21 (T. Br., iii. 4. 17).

recension we read (xi. 3. 3, 6. 3): "This is your king, O ye Kurus, O ye Pañchálas." * The second passage occurs in connection with the horse sacrifice (xxiii. 18). The *mahishí*, or principal wife of the king, performing this sacrifice, must, in order to obtain a son, pass the night by the side of the horse that has been immolated, placing its *śísna* on her *upastha*; with her fellow-wives, who are forced to accompany her, she pours forth her sorrow in this lament: "O Ambá, O Ambiká, O Ambáliká, no one takes me (by force to the horse); (but if I go not of myself), the (spiteful) horse will lie with (another, as) the (wicked) Subhadrá who dwells in Kámpíla." † Kámpíla is a town in the country of the Pañchálas. Subhadrá, therefore, would seem to be the wife of the king of that district, ‡ and the benefits of the *asvamedha* sacrifice are supposed to accrue to them, unless the *mahishí* consents voluntarily to give herself up to this revolting ceremony. If we are justified in regarding the *mahishí* as the consort of a king of the Kurus,—and the names Ambiká and Ambáliká actually appear in this connection in the Mahá-Bhárata, to wit, as the names of the mothers of Dhritarashtra and Páñdu,—we might then with probability infer that there existed a hostile, jealous feeling on the part of the Kurus towards the Pañchálas, a feeling which was possibly at that time only smouldering, but which in the epic legend of the Mahá-Bhárata we find had burst out into the flame of open warfare. However this may be, the allusion to Kámpíla at all events betrays that the verse, or even the whole book (as well as the correspond-

* Sáyana, on the corresponding passage of the Bráhmaṇa (v. 3. 3. 11), remarks that Baudháyana reads *esha vo Bharatá rájeti* [thus T. S., i. 8. 10. 2; T. Br., i. 7. 4. 2]. Apastamba, on the contrary, lets us choose between *Bharatá*, *Kuravo*, *Pañchálá*, *Kurupañchálá*, or *janá rájá*, according to the people to whom the king belongs. [The Káth., xv. 7, has *esha te janate rájá*.]

† The Bráhmaṇa of the White Yajus quotes only the beginning of this verse; consequently the words

subhadrikám kámpilavásintm are wanting in it.

‡ As a matter of fact, we find in the Mahá-Bhárata a Subhadrá as wife of Arjuna, the representative of the Pañchálas; on account of a Subhadrá (possibly on account of her abduction, related in the Mahá-Bhárata?) a great war seems to have arisen, as appears from some words quoted several times by the scholiast on Páñini. Has he the authority of the Mahábháshya for this? [the Mahábháshya has nothing about it].

ing passages of the Taitt. Bráhmāna), originated in the region of the Pañchálas; and this inference holds good also for the eleventh book of the Kánva recension.¹²⁹ We might further adduce in proof of it the use of the word *arjuna* in the Mádhyamdina, and of *phalguna* in the Kánva recension, in a formula¹³⁰ relating to the sacrifice at the consecration of the king (x. 21): "To obtain intrepidity, to obtain food(, I, the offerer, ascend) thee(, O chariot,) I, the inviolate Arjuna (Phalguna)," i.e., Indra, Indra-like. For although we must take both these words in this latter sense, and not as proper names (see *I. St.*, i. 190), yet, at any rate, some connection must be assumed between this use and the later one, where they appear as the appellation of the chief hero of the Pándus (or Pañchálas?); and this connection consists in the fact that the legend specially applied these names of Indra* to that hero of the Pándus (or Pañchálas?) who was pre-eminently regarded by it as an incarnation of Indra.

Lastly, as regards the critical relation of the *richas* incorporated into the Yajus, I have to observe, that in general the two recensions of the Kánvas and of the Mádhyamdinas always agree with each other in this particular, and that their differences refer, rather, to the Yajus-portions. One half of the Vájasaneyi-Samhitá consists of *richas*, or verses; the other of *yajúnshi*, i.e., formulas in prose, a measured prose, too, which rises now and then to a true rhythmical swing. The greater number of these *richas*

¹²⁹ In T. S., vii. 4. 19. 1, Káth. Ás., iv. 8, there are two vocatives instead of the two accusatives; besides, we have *subhage* for *subhad-rām*. The vocative *kāmpilārsini* is explained by Śāyana, 'O thou that art veiled in a beautiful gar-

¹³⁰ See V. S., x. 21; the parallel passages in T. S., i. 8, 15, T. Br., i. 7 9. 1, Káth, xv. 8, have nothing of this.

* The Bráhmāna, moreover, expressly designates *arjuna* as the 'secret name' (*guhyaṃ náma*) of Indra [n. i. 2 11, v. 4. 3 7]. How is this to be understood? The commentary remarks on it: *arjuna iti kīndrasya rahasyam náma | ata era khalu tatputre Pāṇḍaramadhyame prapṛtīh* [What is the reading of the Kánva recension in these passages? Has it, as in the Samhitá, so here also, *nót arjuna*, but *phalguna*?]

must be retained, at least for the wording of the text which we have in the V. S. In the Pratijñá-Parishṭa, Kāmpilya is given as the eastern limit of Madhyadeśa; see my *Pratijñásūtra*, pp. 101-105.

recension we read (xi. 3. 3. 6. 3): "This is your king, O ye Kurus, O ye Pañchālas." * The second passage occurs in connection with the horse sacrifice (xxiii. 18). The *mahishī*, or principal wife of the king, performing this sacrifice, must, in order to obtain a son, pass the night by the side of the horse that has been immolated, placing its *śiśnu* on her *upastha*; with her fellow-wives, who are forced to accompany her, she pours forth her sorrow in this lament: "O Ambā, O Ambikā, O Ambālikā, no one takes me (by force to the horse): (but if I go not of myself), the (spiteful) horse will lie with (another, as) the (wicked) Subhadrá who dwells in Kāmpīla." † Kāmpīla is a town in the country of the Pañchālas. Subhadrá, therefore, would seem to be the wife of the king of that district, ‡ and the benefits of the *āśvamedha* sacrifice are supposed to accrue to them, unless the *mahishī* consents voluntarily to give herself up to this revolting ceremony. If we are justified in regarding the *mahishī* as the consort of a king of the Kurus,—and the names Ambikā and Ambālikā actually appear in this connection in the Mahā-Bhārata, to wit, as the names of the mothers of Dhritarāshtra and Pāṇḍu,—we might then with probability infer that there existed a hostile, jealous feeling on the part of the Kurus towards the Pañchālas, a feeling which was possibly at that time only smouldering, but which in the epic legend of the Mahā-Bhārata we find had burst out into the flame of open warfare. However this may be, the allusion to Kāmpīla at all events betrays that the verse, or even the whole book (as well as the correspond-

* Śāyana, on the corresponding passage of the Brāhmaṇa (v. 3. 3. 11), remarks that Baudhāyana reads *esha ro Bharatā rājati* [thus T. S., i. 8. 10. 2; T. Br., i. 7. 4. 2]. Apastamba, on the contrary, lets us choose between *Bharatā*, *Kuravo*, *Pañchālā*, *Kurupañchālā*, or *janā rājā*, according to the people to whom the king belongs. [The Kāth., xv. 7, has *esha te janate rājā*.]

† The Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus quotes only the beginning of this verse; consequently the words

subhadrikām kāmpilavāsiniṃ are wanting in it.

‡ As a matter of fact, we find in the Mahā-Bhārata a Subhadrá as wife of Arjuna, the representative of the Pañchālas; on account of a Subhadrá (possibly on account of her abduction, related in the Mahā-Bhārata?) a great war seems to have arisen, as appears from some words quoted several times by the scholiast on Pāṇini. Has he the authority of the Mahābhāshya for this? [the Mahābhāshya has nothing about it].

ing passages of the Taitt. Bráhmāna), originated in the region of the Pañchālas; and this inference holds good also for the eleventh book of the Kāṇva recension.¹²⁹ We might further adduce in proof of it the use of the word *arjuna* in the Mādhyam̐dina, and of *phalguna* in the Kāṇva recension, in a formula¹³⁰ relating to the sacrifice at the consecration of the king (x. 21): "To obtain intrepidity, to obtain food(, I, the offerer, ascend) thee(, O chariot,) I, the inviolate Arjuna (Phalguna)," i.e., Indra, Indra-like. For although we must take both these words in this latter sense, and not as proper names (see *I. St.*, i. 190), yet, at any rate, some connection must be assumed between this use and the later one, where they appear as the appellation of the chief hero of the Pándus (or Pañchālas?); and this connection consists in the fact that the legend specially applied these names of Indra* to that hero of the Pándus (or Pañchālas?) who was pre-eminently regarded by it as an incarnation of Indra.

Lastly, as regards the critical relation of the *richas* incorporated into the Yajus, I have to observe, that in general the two recensions of the Kāṇvas and of the Mādhyam̐dinas always agree with each other in this particular, and that their differences refer, rather, to the Yajus-portions. One half of the Vájasaneyi-Samhitá consists of *richas*, or verses; the other of *yajúñshi*, i.e., formulas in prose, a measured prose, too, which rises now and then to a true rhythmical swing. The greater number of these *richas*

¹²⁹ In T. S., vii. 4. 19. 1, Káth. Ás, iv. 8, there are two vocatives instead of *arjuna* and *phalguna*.

¹³⁰ See V. S., x. 21; the parallel passages in T. S., i. 8, 15, T. Br., i. 7. 9. 1, Káth, xv. 8, have nothing of this.

* The Bráhmāna, moreover, expressly designates *arjuna* as the 'secret name' (*guhyaṃ náma*) of Indra [ii. 1. 2. 11, v. 4. 3. 7]. How is this to be understood? The commentary remarks on it: *arjuna iti kīndrasya śahasyaṃ náma | atāra khalu tatputre Pándavamadhyaṃe pratītiḥ*. [What is the reading of the Kāṇva recension in these passages? Has it, as in the Samhitá, so here also, not *arjuna*, but *phalguna*?]

must be retained, at least for the wording of the text which we have in the V. S. In the Pratijñá-Pariśeṣa, Kūmpilya is given as the eastern limit of Madhyadeśa; see my *Pratijñásātra*, pp. 101-105.

recur in the Rik-Samhitá; and frequently with considerable variations, the origin and explanation of which I have already discussed in the introduction (see above, pp. 9, 10). Readings more ancient than those of the Rik are not found in the Yajus, or at least only once in a while, which results mainly from the fact that Rik and Yajus agree for the most part with each other, as opposed to the Sáman. We do, however, find that verses have undergone later alterations to adapt them to the sense of the ritual. And finally, we meet with a large number of readings which appear of equal authority with those of the Rik, especially in the verses which recur in those portions of the Rik-Samhitá that are to be regarded as the most modern.

The Vájasaneyi-Samhitá, in both recensions, has been edited by myself (Berlin, 1849-52), with the commentary of Mahídharma,¹³¹ written towards the end of the sixteenth century; and in the course of next year a translation is intended to appear, which will give the ceremonial belonging to each verse, together with a full glossary.* Of the work of Uāta, a predecessor of Mahídharma, only fragments have been preserved, and the commentary of Mádhava, which related to the Kánva recension,¹³² appears to be entirely lost. Both were supplanted by Mahídharma's work, and consequently obliterated; an occurrence which has happened in a similar way in almost all branches of Indian literature, and is greatly to be regretted.

I now turn to the *Bráhmaṇa* of the White Yajus, the *Satapatha-Bráhmaṇa*, which, from its compass and contents, undoubtedly occupies the most significant and important position of all the *Bráhmaṇas*. First, as to its

¹³¹ For which, unfortunately, no sufficient manuscript materials were at my disposal; see Müller, Preface to vol. vi. of his large edition of the Rik, p. xlv. sqq., and my reply in *Literarisches Centralblatt*, 1875, pp. 519, 520.

* [This promise has not been fulfilled, owing to the pressure of other labours.] The fortieth *adhyāya*, the *Isopanishad*, is in the Kánva recension commented by Śaṅkara; it has been translated and edited several times together with this commen-

tary. (lately again by Roer in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, vol. viii.) [and vol. xv.—A lithographed edition of the text of the Vájas. Samhitá, with a Hindí translation of Mahídharma's commentary, has been published by Giriprasádavarman, Rája of Besma, 1870-74, in Besma].

¹³² Upon what this special statement is based I cannot at present show; but that Mádhava commented the V. S. also is shown, for example, by the quotation in Mahídharma to xiii. 45.

extent,—this is sufficiently denoted by its very name, which describes it as consisting of 100 *pathas* (paths), or sections. The earliest known occurrence of this name is in the ninth *vārttika* to Pān. iv. 2. 60, and in the *gana* to Pān. v. 3. 100, both authorities of very doubtful* antiquity. The same remark applies to the *Naigeya-dairata*, where the name also appears (see Benfey's *Sāmaveda*, p. 277). With the single exception of a passage in the twelfth book of the Mahā-Bhārata, to which I shall revert in the sequel, I have only met with it, besides, in the commentaries and in the colophons of the MSS. of the work itself. In the Mādhyamīna school the Śatapatha-Brahmaṇa consists of fourteen *kāṇḍas*, each of which bears a special title in the commentaries and in the colophons: these titles are usually borrowed from the contents, ii. and vii. are, however, to me inexplicable.† The fourteen *kāṇḍas* are together subdivided into 100 *adhyāyas* (or 68 *prapāṭhakas*), 438 *brāhmanas*, and 7624 *kaṇḍikās*¹²³. In the Kāṇva recension the work consists of seventeen *kāṇḍas*, the first, fifth, and fourteenth books being each divided into two parts; the first book, moreover, has here changed places with the second, and forms, consequently, the second and third. The names of the books are the same, but the division into *prapāṭhakas* is altogether unknown: the *adhyāyas* in the thirteen and a half books that have thus far been recovered* number 85, the *brāhmanas* 360, the *kaṇḍikās* 4965. The total for the whole work amounts, according to a list accompanying one of the manuscripts, to 104 *adhyāyas*, 446 *brāhmanas*, 5866 *kaṇḍikās*. If from this the recension of the Kāṇva school seems considerably

* The *gana* is an *akṛitigana*, and the *sūtra* to which it belongs is, according to the Calcutta edition, not explained in the Mahābhāṣya; possibly therefore it does not belong to the original text of Pāṇini. [The *vārttika* in question is, in point of fact, explained in the Mahābhāṣya (fol. 67^b), and thus the existence of the name *śatapatha*, as well as *śaśā-*

Elapadīd, that of the seventh *Has-tigāṣa*.

¹²³ For statements disagreeing with this, which are found in the MSS., see note on pp. 119, 120.

‡ Of the fourth book there exists only the first half; and the third, thirteenth, and sixteenth books are wanting altogether. [It is much to be regretted that nothing has yet been done for the Kāṇva recension, and that a complete copy has not yet been recovered.]

shorter than that of the *Mādhyamdinas*, it is so only in appearance; the disparity is probably rather to be explained by the greater length of the *kāṇḍikas* in the former. Omissions, it is true, not unfrequently occur. For the rest, I have no means of ascertaining with perfect accuracy the precise relation of the *Brāhmaṇa* of the *Kāṇva* school to that of the *Mādhyamdinas*; and what I have to say in the sequel will therefore relate solely to the latter, unless I expressly mention the former.

As I have already remarked, when speaking of the *Samhitā*, the first nine *kāṇḍas* of the *Brāhmaṇa* refer to the first eighteen books of the *Samhitā*; they quote the separate verses in the same order* word for word, explaining them dogmatically, and establishing their connection with the ritual. The tenth *kāṇḍa*, which bears the name of *Agni-rahasya* ("the mystery of fire"), contains mystical legends and investigations as to the significance, &c., of the various ceremonies connected with the preparation of the sacred fires, without referring to any particular portions of the *Samhitā*. This is the case likewise in the eleventh *kāṇḍa*, called from its extent *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, which contains a recapitulation of the entire ritual already discussed, with supplements thereto, especially legends bearing upon it, together with special particulars concerning the study of the sacred works and the provisions made for this purpose. The twelfth *kāṇḍa*, called *Madhyama*, "the middle one," treats of *prāyaścittas* or propitiatory ceremonies for untoward events, either previous to the sacrifice, during, or after it; and it is only in its last portion, where the *Sautrāmanī* is discussed, that it refers to certain of the formulas contained in the *Samhitā* (xix.-xxi.) and relating to this ceremony. The thirteenth *kāṇḍa*, called *Āśvamedha*, treats at some length of the horse sacrifice; and then with extreme brevity of the human sacrifice, the universal sacrifice, and the sacrifice to the Manes; touching upon the relative portions of the *Samhitā* (xxii.-xxxv.) but very seldom, and even then very slightly. The fourteenth *kāṇḍa*, called *Āraṇyaka*, treats in its first three *adhyāyas*

* Only in the introduction does a variation occur, as the *Brāhmaṇa* treats first of the morning and evening sacrifices, and not till afterwards

of the new moon and full moon sacrifices, which is evidently more correct systematically.

of the purification of the fire,¹³⁴ and here it quotes almost in their entirety the three last books but one of the *Samhitā* (xxxvii–xxxix); the last six *adhyāyas* are of a purely speculative and legendary character, and form by themselves a distinct work, or Upanishad, under the name of *Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka*. This general summary of the contents of the several *kāṇḍas* of itself suggests the conjecture that the first nine constitute the most ancient part of the *Brāhmaṇa*, and that the last five, on the contrary, are of later origin,—a conjecture which closer investigation reduces to a certainty, both on external and internal evidence. With reference to the external evidence, in the first place, we find it distinctly stated in the passage of the *Mahā-Bhārata* above alluded to (xii 11734) that the complete *Śatapatha* comprises a *Rahasya* (the tenth *kāṇḍa*), a *Samgraha* (the eleventh *kāṇḍa*), and a *Parīśeṣa* (the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth *kāṇḍas*). Further, in the *vārttika* already quoted for the name *Śatapatha*, we also meet with the word *śaśṣṭipatha*¹³⁵ as the name of a work; and I have no hesitation in referring this name to the first nine *kāṇḍas*, which collectively number sixty *adhyāyas*. On the other hand, in support of the opinion that the last five *kāṇḍas* are a later addition to the first nine, I have to adduce the term *Madhyama* ("the middle one"), the name of the twelfth *kāṇḍa*, which can only be accounted for in this way, whether we refer it merely to the last three *kāṇḍas* but one, or to all the five.*

¹³⁴ The *prātargya* concerns, rather, the lustration of the sacrificer himself; see above note 124, p. 108.

¹³⁵ It is found in the *Pratijñā-Parīśeṣa* also, and along with it the name *śṣṭipatha* (1); *śatapatha*, on the contrary, is apparently wanting there; see my essay on the *Pratijñā-Sūtra*, pp. 104, 105.

* In the latter case a difficulty is caused by the *Kāṇva* recension, which subdivides the last *kāṇḍa* into two parts (xvi, xvii); this division, however, seems not to have been generally received, since in the MSS of *Śaṅkara's* commentary, at least, the Upanishad (xvii.) is reckoned throughout as beginning with the

third *adhyāya* (viz., of the *kāṇḍa*), so that xvi and xvii. coincide.—[A highly remarkable statement is found in the MSS of the *Mādhyamīna* recension at v. 3. 1. 14, to the effect that this point marks not only *lāṇḍasyā 'rdham*, with 236 *landikās*, but also, according to a marginal gloss, *śatapathasyā 'rdham*, with 3129 *landikās*; see p. 497 of my edition. As a matter of fact, the preceding *landikās* do amount to this latter number; but if we fix it as the norm for the second half, we are only brought down to xii. 7. 3. 18, that is, not even to the end of the twelfth. The which marks *]

Now these last five *kāṇḍas* appear to stand in the same order in which they actually and successively originated; so that each succeeding one is to be regarded as less ancient than the one that precedes it. This conjecture is based on internal evidence drawn from the data therein contained,—evidence which at the same time decides the question of their being posterior to the first nine *kāṇḍas*. In the first place, the tenth *kāṇḍa* still connects itself pretty closely with the preceding books, especially in its great veneration for Śāṇḍilya, the principal authority upon the building of altars for the sacred fires. The following are the data which seem to me to favour the view that it belongs to a different period from the first nine books. In i. 5. 1, ff., all the sacrifices already discussed in the preceding books are enumerated in their proper order, and identified with the several ceremonies of the Agni-chayana, or preparation of the sacred fireplace.—Of the names of teachers here mentioned, several end in *-āyana*, a termination of which we find only one example in the seventh, eighth, and ninth *kāṇḍas* respectively: thus we meet here with a Rauhināyana, Sāyakāyana, Vāmaka-kshāyana (also in vii.), Rājastambāyana, Śāṇḍilyāyana (also in ix.), Śātyāyana (also in viii.), and the Śākāyanins.—The Vanśa appended at the close (*i.e.*, the list of the teachers of this book) differs from the general Vanśa of the entire Brāhmaṇa (at the close of the fourteenth book) in not referring the work to Yājñavalkya, but to Śāṇḍilya, and also to Tura Kāvasheya (whose ancestor Kavasha we find on the banks of the Sarasvatī in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa). The only tribes mentioned are the Salvas and Kekayas (especially their king, Aśvapati Kaikeya),—two western tribes not elsewhere alluded to in the Brāhmaṇas.—The

present extent of the work (3812 k.) is at vi. 7. 1. 19, where also the MSS. repeat the above statement (p. 555).—It deserves special mention that the notation of the accents operates beyond the limits of the individual *kāṇḍikās*, the accent at the end of a *kāṇḍikā* being modified by the accent of the first word of the next *kāṇḍikā*. From this we might perhaps conclude that the

marking of the accents is earlier in date than the division of the text into *kāṇḍikās*. As, however, we find exactly the same state of things with regard to the final and initial words of the individual *brāhmaṇas* (see *Jenac Literaturzeitung*, 1875, p. 314), we should also have to refer the *brāhmaṇa* division to a later date, and this is hardly possible].

legends here as well as in the four succeeding *kāṇḍas* are mostly of an historical character, and are besides chiefly connected with individual teachers who cannot have lived at a time very distant from that of the legends themselves. In the earlier *kāṇḍas*, on the contrary, the legends are mostly of a mythological character, or, if historical, refer principally to occurrences belonging to remote antiquity; so that here a distinct difference is evident.—The *trayi vidyā* (the three Vedas) is repeatedly discussed in a very special manner, and the number of the *ṛichas* is stated to be 12,000, that of the *yajus*-verses 8000, and that of the *sāmans* 4000. Here also for the first time appear the names *Adhvaryus*, *Bahvṛichas*, and *Chhandogas* side by side;* here, too, we have the first occurrence of the words *upanishad* (as *sāra* of the Veda), *upanishadām ādeśāh*, *mīmāṃsā* (mentioned once before, it is true, in the first *kāṇḍa*), *adhiveratam*, *adhiyajnam*, *adhyātmam*;¹³⁶ and lastly, here for the first time we have the form of address *bharān* (instead of the earlier *bhagarān*). Now and then also a *śloka* is quoted in confirmation, a thing which occurs extremely seldom in the preceding books. Further, many of the technical names of the *sāmans* and *śāstras* are mentioned (this, however, has occurred before, and also in the tenth book of the *Samhitā*); and generally, frequent reference is made to the connection subsisting with the *ṛichas* and *sāmans*, which harmonises with the peculiarly mystical character of the whole *kāṇḍa*.

supplement to the first
its contents

The first two *adhyāyas* treat of the sacrifices at the new and full moon; the four following, of the morning and evening sacrificial fires, of the sacrifices at the three seasons of the year, the inauguration of the pupil by the teacher (*āchārya*), of the deeper study of the sacred doctrines, &c., and the last of the sacrifices of animals. The *Rigveda*, *Yajurveda*, *Sāmaveda*, the *Atharvāṅgirasas*, the *anuvāsanās*, the *vākorūkya*, the *itihaśapurāṇa*, the *nārāśaṃsīs*, &c. are named as subjects of study. We have

* *yātuvīdas* (those who perform the sacrifices), *śarpavīdas* (serpent-keepers), *detajanavīdas* (those who perform the sacrifices), *adhyātmam* occur several times in the earlier books.

already met with this enumeration (see p. 93) in the second chapter of the Taitt. Āraṇyaka, although in a considerably later form,* and we find a similar one in the fourteenth *kāṇḍa*. In all these passages, the commentaries,† probably with perfect justice, interpret these expressions in this way, viz., that first the Samhitās are specified, and then the different parts of the Brāhmaṇas; so that by the latter set of terms we should have to understand, not distinct species of works, but only the several portions respectively so designated which were blended together in the Brāhmaṇas, and out of which the various branches of literature were in course of time gradually developed. The terms *anuvāsaṇa* ("ritual precept" according to Sāyaṇa, but in Vṛihad-Ār., ii. 5. 19, iv. 3. 25, Kāthopan., 6. 15, "spiritual doctrine"), *vidyā*, "spiritual doctrine," and *gāthā*, "strophe of a song" (along with *śloka*), are in fact so used in a few passages (*gāthā* indeed pretty frequently) in these last five books, and in the Brāhmaṇas or Upanishads of the Rik and Sāman. Similarly *vākovākya* in the sense of "disputation" occurs in the seventh *kāṇḍa*, and *itihāsa* at least once in the eleventh *kāṇḍa* itself (i. 6. 9). It is only the expressions *purāṇa* and *nārāsaṇsīs* that do not thus occur; in their stead—in the sense of narrative, legend—we find, rather, the terms *ākhyāna*, *vyākhyāna*, *anvākhyāna*, *upākhyāna*. *Vyākhyāna*, together with *anuvyākhyāna* and *upavyākhyāna*, also occurs in the sense of "explanation." In these expressions, accordingly, we have evidence that at the time of this eleventh *kāṇḍa* certain Samhitās and Brāhmaṇas of the various Vedas, and even the Atharva-Samhitā itself, were in existence. But, further, as bearing upon this point, in addition to the single verses from the songs of the Rik, which are here, as in the earlier books, frequently cited (by "*tad etad rishinā 'bhy-anūktam*"), we have in the eleventh *kāṇḍa* one very special quotation, extending over an entire hymn, and introduced by the words "*tad etad uktapratyuktam pañchadaśarcham Bahvrichāḥ prāhuḥ*." It is an interesting fact for the critic that in our text of the Rik the hymn in question

* From it has evidently originated a passage in Yājñavalkya's Code (i. 45), which does not harmonise at all with the rest of that work.

† Here Sāyaṇa forms an exception, as he at least states the other explanation also.

(*mand.* x. 95) numbers not fifteen but eighteen *richas*. Single *ślokas* are also frequently quoted as confirmation. From one of these it appears that the care taken of horses in the palace of Janamejaya had at that time passed into a proverb: this is also the first mention of this king Rudra here for the first time receives the name of Mahádeva* (v. 3. 5).—In iii. 3. 1, ff., special rules are for the first time given concerning the begging (*bhikshá*) of the *brahmachárin*s, &c., which custom is besides alluded to in the thirtieth book of the *Saṃhitá* [v. 18]—But what throws special light upon the date of the eleventh *kánda* is the frequent mention here made, and for the first time, of Janaka, king (*samráj*) of Videha, as the patron of Yájnavalkya. The latter, the Kaurupañchála Uddálaka Áruṇi and his son Śvetaketu, are (as in the *Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka*) the chief figures in the legends.

The twelfth *kánda* alludes to the destruction of the kingdom of the Srin̄jayas, whom we find in the second *kánda* at the height of their prosperity, and associated with the Kurus. This connection may still be traced here, for it seems as if the Kauravya Valhika Prátiptiya wished to take their part against Chákra, their enemy, who was a native of the country south of the Revá, and priest of King Dush̄tarítu of Daśapurushamrájya, but that his efforts failed.—The names Várkali (i.e., Váshkali) and Náka Maudgalya probably also point to a later period of time; the latter does not occur elsewhere except in the *Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka* and the *Taittiríyopaniṣad*.—The *Rigveda*, the *Yajurveda*, and the *Sámvaveda* are mentioned, and we find testimony to the existence of the Vedic literature generally in the statement that a ceremony once taught by Indra to Vasis̄thha and formerly only known to the Vasis̄thhas—whence in former times only a Vasis̄thha could act as *brahman* (high priest) at its performance—might now be studied by any one who liked, and consequently that any one might officiate as *brahman* thereat¹³⁷.—In iii. 4. 1 occurs the first mention of *purusha Náráyana*.—The name of Proti Kauśámbeya Kausurubindí probably presupposes the existence of the Pañchála city Kauśámbí.

* In the sixth *kánda* he is still called mahán devaḥ.

¹³⁷ See *loc. cit.* I. 5.

The thirteenth *kāṇḍa* repeatedly mentions *puruṣa Nārāyaṇa*. Here also Kuvera Vaiśravaṇa, king of the Rakshasas, is named for the first time. So, too, we find here the first allusion to the *sūktas* of the Rik, the *anuvākas** of the Yajus, the *daśats* of the Sāman, and the *parvans* of the Atharvāṇas and Āṅgirasas, which division, however, does not appear in the extant text of the Atharvan. A division into *parvans* is also mentioned in connection with the Sarpavidyā and the Devajānavidyā, so that by these names at all events distinct works must be understood. Of Itihāsa and Purāṇa nothing but the name is given; they are not spoken of as divided into *parvans*, a clear proof that even at that time they were merely understood as isolated stories and legends, and not as works of any extent.¹³³—While in the first nine books the statement that a subject has been fully treated of already is expressed by *tasyokto bandhuh* [or, *so 'śuv eva bandhuh*, and the like], the same is expressed here by *tasyoktam brāhmaṇam*.—The use in v. 1. 18 of the words *ekavachana* and *bahuvachana* exactly corresponds to their later grammatical signification.—This *kāṇḍa* is, however, very specially distinguished by the number of *gāthās*, strophes of historical purport, which it quotes at the close of the account of the horse sacrifice, and in which are given the names of kings who celebrated it in earlier times. Only one of these *gāthās* appears in the Rik-Saṃhitā (*mand.* iv. 42. 8); the greater number of them recur in the last book of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, and in the Mahā-Bhārata, xii. 910, ff., in both places with many variations.† The question here arises whether we have to regard these *gāthās* as fragments of more lengthy hymns, or if they must be looked upon merely as separate memorial verses. The fact that in connection with some of these names (if we take into account

* This term, however, occurs in the preceding *kāṇḍas* also, e.g., in ix. 1. 1. 15.

¹³³ This is favoured also by the fact that they are here attributed to fishermen and fowlers; with which may be compared the tale of the fishermaid as mother of Vyāsa, in the Mahā-Bhārata. The whole statement recurs in almost identical

terms in the Śāṅkh. Śr., xvi. 2; Āśval. Śr., x. 7.

† The passages in the Mahā-Bhārata evidently connect themselves with the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, to which, as well as to its author Yājñavalkya, and his patron Janaka, special regard is had in this book of the Mahā-Bhārata. [See also Śāṅkh., xvi. 8. 25-29. 32.]

tion to Bhállaveya; while his own opinion, differing from that of the latter, is in turn rejected by Yájñavalkya. On account of the interest of the subject I introduce here another passage from the fourteenth book, from which we may gather the same result. We there find a rival of Yájñavalkya testing him with a question, the solution of which the former had previously obtained from a Gandharva, who held in his possession the daughter of Kápya Patamchala of the country of the Madras;—the question, namely, “Whither have the Párikshitas gone?” the solution of which therefore appears to have been looked upon as extremely difficult. Yájñavalkya answers: “Thither where (all) *ásvamedha* sacrificers go.” Consequently the Párikshitas must at that time have been altogether extinct. Yet their life and end must have been still fresh in the memory of the people, and a subject of general curiosity.* It almost seems as though their “guilt, their *brahmahatyá*,” had been too great for people to believe that it could have been atoned for by sacrifices were they ever so holy; or that by such means the Párikshitas could have become partakers of the reward fixed for other less culpable evil-doers. It appears further as if the Brahmans had taken special pains to rehabilitate their memory, and in this undoubtedly they were completely successful. Or was it, on the contrary, that the majesty and power of the Párikshitas was so great and dazzling, and their end so surprising, that it was difficult to believe they had really passed away? I prefer, however, the former explanation.

The fourteenth *kánda*, at the beginning of its first part (that relating to ritual), contains a legend of a contention among the gods, in which Vishṇu came off victorious, whence it became customary to say, “Vishṇu is the *śreshṭha* (luckiest?) of the gods.” This is the first time that we find Vishṇu brought into such prominence; indeed, he otherwise only appears in the legend of the three strides, and as the representative of the sacrifice itself,—a position which is, in fact, ascribed to

* The country of the Madras lies in the north-west, and is therefore remote from the country of the Kurus. According to the Mahá-Bhárata, however, Mádri, second wife of Páṇdu and mother of the two youngest Páṇdavas, Nakula and Sahadeva, was a native of this region, and Parikshit also had a Mádri-dravatí to wife.

him here also Indra, as here related, afterwards strikes off his head in jealousy.¹³⁹ The second part of this *kāṇḍa*, the *Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka*, which consists of five *prapāṭhakas*, or six *adhyāyas*, is again divided into three *kāṇḍas*, the *Madhukāṇḍa*, *adhy. i. ii. (prap. i. 1-ii. 5)*; the *Yājñavalkya-kāṇḍa*, *adhy. iii. iv. (prap. ii. 6-iv. 3)*; and the *Khilakāṇḍa*, *adhy. v. vi. (prap. iv. 4-v. 5)*. Of these three divisions, each succeeding one appears to be later than that which precedes it, and each closes with a *Vanśa* or statement of the line of teachers, carried back to Brahman, the primeval source. The third *brāhmaṇa* of the *Madhu-kāṇḍa* is an explanation of three *ślokas* prefixed to it, a form of which we have no previous example. The fifth (*adhy. ii. 1*) contains, as has already been stated (p. 51), another recension of the legend related in the fourth *adhyāya* of the *Kaushītaky-Upanishad*, of Ajātaśatru, the king of Kāśī, who was jealous of Janaka's fame as a patron of learning. The eighth (*adhy. ii. 4*) contains another recension of the closing legend in the *Yājñavalkya-kāṇḍa*, of Yājñavalkya's two wives, Maitreyī and Kātyāyanī,—this being the first mention we have of these names. Here, as also in the eleventh *kāṇḍa*, we find an enumeration of the subjects of Vedic study, namely, *Rigveda*, *Yajurveda*, *Sāmaveda*, the *Atharvāṅgrasas*, *itiḥāsa*, *pūrāṇa*, *vidyās*, *upanishads*, *ślokas*, *sūtras*, *anuvyākhyānas*, *vyākhyānas** The same enumeration recurs in the *Yājñavalkya-kāṇḍa* (*adhy. vi. 10*). Śaṅkara and Dvivedagaṅga, the commentators of the *Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka*, both, like Śāyana (on the eleventh *kāṇḍa*), take the expressions *itiḥāsa*, &c., to mean sections in the *Brāhmaṇas*. They are, in fact, as I have already pointed out (p. 122), used in

¹³⁹ This is wrong. The gods send forth ants to gnaw the bowstring of Vishnu, who stands leaning on his bended bow; the string, snapping and springing upwards, severs his head from his body. The same legend recurs not only in the parallel passage of the *Taitt. Ār.* (v. 1), but also in the *Pañch. Br.* vii. 5. 6; but whilst in the *Śat. Br.* it is related of Vishnu, the *Taitt. Ār.* tells it of Mahā Vāsudeva, and

the *Pañch. Br.* of Mahā alone (cf. also *T. S.*, vii. 2. 4. 1). In the *Satapatha*, Mahā is only mentioned among the gods who assembled, though, to be sure, he appears immediately before Vishnu.

* The last five expressions take here the place of *anuvāda*, *vidyā*, *nārāyaṇa*, and *gāthās* in the eleventh book. The latter are clearly the more ancient.

this sense in the Brāhmanas themselves. It is only in regard to *sūtra** that I am unable to prove a similar use (though Dvivedagaṅga pretty frequently calls certain sentences by the name of *sūtra*, e.g., i. 2. 18, 22, 3. 1, &c.); and this term raises a doubt whether the opinion of the commentators ought to hold good with reference to these passages also, and their time. The ninth (which is the last) *brāhmaṇa* is evidently the one from which the Madhu-kāṇḍa received its name. It treats of the intimate relation existing between the four elements (earth, water, fire, air), the sun, the quarters of the heavens, the moon, lightning, thunder, *ākāśa* (ether), &c., on the one hand, and all beings on the other; this relation being set forth by representing the one as the *madhu* (honey) of the other. This doctrine is traced to Dadhyañich Ātharvaṇa, as is also, in fact, done in the Rik-Saṃhitā itself (i. 116. 12. 117. 22). In the beginning of the fourth *kāṇḍa* of the Śatap. Brāhmaṇa also (iv. 1. 5. 18) we find the *madhu nāma brāhmaṇam* mentioned expressly in this connection; Śāyana, too, quotes *Śātyáyana* (-*Vājāsaneyau*) in support of it. A very early date is thus guaranteed for the name at least, and probably also for the contents of this chapter; though its form, of course, cannot make any pretension to high antiquity. The concluding *Vaṇśa* here, as elsewhere, varies very much in the two schools; that is, as regards the last twenty members or so back to Yāska and Āsurāyana; but from these upwards to the mythical fountain-heads the two schools generally agree. Āsurāyana himself (consequently, also Yāska, who is recorded as his contemporary) is here placed two stages after Āsuri; at the end of the Khila-kāṇḍa he is even designated as his pupil; Āsuri, again, being set down as the pupil of Yājñavalkya. The list closes, therefore, with about the twenty-fifth member from the latter. It must consequently have been continued long after the Madhu-kāṇḍa had been finally put into shape, since both the analogy of the *Vaṇśa* contained in the last *brāhmaṇa* but one of the Khila-kāṇḍa and the very nature of the case forbid the

* The word *sūtra* is found several times here, but in the sense of 'thread, band,' only, to denote the supreme Brahman itself, which, like a band, embraces and holds together everything.

conclusion that its redaction could have taken place so late as the twenty-fifth generation from Yājñavalkya. The commentators never enter into any explanation of these *Vaṅśas*; doubtless, therefore, they too regarded them as

highly con-
f the
Yājñavalkya-kāṇḍa is the glorification of Yājñavalkya, and it recounts how, at the court of his patron Janaka, king of Videha, he silenced all the Brahmins* of the Kurupañchālas, &c., and gained his patron's full confidence (like the corresponding legends in the twelfth book of the *Mahā-Bhārata*). The legend narrated in the eleventh *kāṇḍa* (vi. 3. 1 ff) may perhaps have been the model; at least the *Yājñavalkya* here begins in exactly the same manner, and gives also, almost in the same words, the account of the discomfiture and punishment of Vidagdha Śākalya, which alone is given in the eleventh *kāṇḍa*. It closes with a legend already given in the *Madhu-kāṇḍa*, but with some deviations. The expressions *pāṇḍitya*, *muni*, and *mauna*, occurring in this *kāṇḍa*, are worthy of special notice as being new¹⁰ (iii. 2. 1, iv. 2. 25); further, *ekahaṁsa*, *śramaṇa*, *tāpasa* (iv. 1. 12, 22), *pravrājīn* (iv. 2. 25, where *bhikṣhacharya* is recommended), and *pratibuddha* (iv. 2. 17; the verb *pratibudh* occurs in this sense i. 2. 21), and lastly, the names *chāṇḍāla* and *paulkasa* (iv. 1. 22). I am now of opinion† that it is to this *Yājñavalkya-kāṇḍa* that the *vārttika* to Pāṇini iv. 3. 105 refers when it speaks of the *Yājñavalkya brāhmanāni* as not *pūrāṇa-prokta*, but *tulyakāla*, "contemporaneous," i.e., with Pāṇini. The wording of the *vārttika* does not necessarily imply that

* Among them Aśvala, the king's Hotar, Vidagdha Śākalya, who lost his life for his impertinence, Kabala Kaushtakeya, and Gārgi Vāchaknavi, who all four (the latter, at least, according to the *Grihya-Sūtra*) may be looked upon as representatives of the *Rik*, towards which therefore a kind of jealousy is here unmistakably exhibited.

¹⁰ "The word *muni* occurs in the later portions of the *Rik-Sam-*

hitā, viz., vii. 17. 14, and x. 136. 2-5"—First German edition, Errata. *Paulkasa* is found also in V. S. 30. 17.

† Formerly I was of different opinion; see *I. St.*, i. 57. Many of the views there expressed—especially pp. 161-232—have here either been further developed or modified after careful consideration of the various passages, as may be perceived by comparison.

these Bráhmaṇas originated from Yájnavalkya himself; consequently they might bear his name simply because treating of him. I prefer the latter view, for it appears to me very hazardous to regard the entire Śatapatha-Bráhmaṇa, or even its last books only, as directly bearing the name of Yájnavalkya,—however fully it may embody his system,—or to set it down as contemporaneous with, or but little anterior to, Páṇini. In regard to the Yájnavalkya-kāṇḍa, however, I have not the slightest hesitation in doing the latter.¹⁴¹—Finally, the *Khila-kāṇḍa*, or last *kāṇḍa* of the Vṛihad-Áranyaka, is uniformly described by the commentators as such a *khila*, or supplement; and as a matter of fact it is clearly enough distinguished from the other *kāṇḍas*. Its first *adhyāya*—the fifth of the Vṛihad-Áranyaka—is made up of a number of small fragments, which contain for the most part mystical plays upon words, of the most clumsy description. The second *adhyāya* contains two *bráhmaṇas*, parts of which, as I have already remarked (p. 71), recur in precisely the same form in the Chhándogyopanishad vii. 1, 3. Of the third *bráhmaṇa*, which contains ritual injunctions, we also find another recension, *ibid.* vii. 2. It concludes with a *Vanśa*, not, however, in the form of a list, but of a detailed account. According to it, the first author of the doctrine here taught was Uddálaka Áruṇi, who imparted it to Yájnavalkya, here for the first time called Vájasaneyā; * his pupil was Madhuka Pañgya, from whom the doctrine was transmitted to Chúda Bhágavitti, then to Jánaki Ayahsthúna, and lastly to Satyakáma Jábála. The name of the latter (a teacher often alluded to in the Chhándogyopanishad) is in fact borne in later works by a school of the White Yajus, so

¹⁴¹ On this subject compare Goldstücker's detailed discussion in his *Páṇini*, p. 132-140, and my special rejoinder, *J. St.*, v. 65-74, xiii. 443, 444, *J. Str.*, ii. 214. According to these expositions, the author of the *várttikas* must, on the one hand, have considered the *Yájnavalkya Bráhmaṇa* as originally promulgated (*prokta*) by Yájnavalkya; but, on the other hand, he must also have looked upon the recension then extant as contemporaneous with Pá-

nini. Although he here counts Yájnavalkya among the *purāṇas*, 'ancients,'—and this interpretation is required by the wording of the *várttika*,—yet the *Káśiká*, on the contrary, expressly declares him to be "not *chirakāla*."

* In the Yájnavalkyakāṇḍa Uddálaka Áruṇi is, like the other Brahmanas, silenced by Yájnavalkya, no mention being made of his being the preceptor of the latter.

that we might perhaps ascribe to him the final a of this doctrine in its existing form. The fourth *bráhmana* of this *adhyáya* is, like the third, supposed to be the native of its contents, which, consisting from the rites to be observed before, and at the time of the birth of a son, more coitus, as well as after the birth of a son, more pertain to a Grihya-Sútra. It too closes with a V as the more recent members are concerned, by this peculiarity, that their names are formed by the addition of parts of the mother's name (see above p. 71), and that the pupil of Yájnavalkya, and the latter the pupil of Uddálaka. Then, having passed through ten more stages we find the following words as the close of the whole *Bráhmana*: *ádityáni mání súkláni yajúnshu Vájusaneyena Vájnavalkyendá* 'these White Yajus-texts originating † from Aditya are transmitted by Vájasaneyana Vájnavalkya.' According to Samkara and Drivedagaṅga, this Vāśa does not refer to the Khila-kāṇḍa, but to the entire Pravachana, the entire Veda (i.e., the White Yajus). This view is at all events favoured by the fact that the Vāśa at the close of the tenth book (the only one which appears in the whole of the Śatapatha-Brahmana, besides those of the Madhu-kāṇḍa, Yájnavalkya-kāṇḍa, and Khila-kāṇḍa) † evidently refers to this Vāśa, and presupposes its existence when at its commencement it says: *śamānam ī Sámjivíputrá*, 'up to Sámjivíputra the teachers are the same.' For, ascending from this Sámjivíputra, there are still in this Vāśa three steps up to Yájnavalkya, while in the tenth book, as before remarked, the doctrine is not traced up to the latter at all, but from Sámjivíputra through five steps to Śāṇḍilya, and through two more to Yajña Kávasheya. §—This latter circumstance suggests to

* In the Kāṇva recension the Vāśa here too at the close after the words: *Vájnavalkyendá "khyádyante."*
 † Who is quoted in the Aitar. *Bráhmana* as contemporaneous with Janamejaya (as his sacrificial priest); see I. Ś., 1. 203, note.
 ‡ In the Kāṇva recension the separate Vāśa here too at the close after the words: *Vájnavalkyendá "khyádyante."*
 § Who is quoted in the Aitar. *Bráhmana* as contemporaneous with Janamejaya (as his sacrificial priest); see I. Ś., 1. 203, note.

us, moreover, the possibility of yet another division of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa with reference to the origin of the different *kāṇḍas*. For in the first five and the last four *kāṇḍas* the name of Yājñavalkya meets us exclusively, and very frequently, as that of the teacher whose opinion is appealed to as the decisive authority, whose system consequently is in any case there set forth.* Further, if we except the Yājñavalkya-kāṇḍa and the *gāthās* in the thirteenth *kāṇḍa*, races settled in eastern or central Hindustān are the only ones mentioned in these *kāṇḍas*, viz., the Kurupañchālas, Kosalavidehas, Śviknas, and Srinjayas. Once only the Prāchyas (eastern tribes) are opposed to the Vālikas (western tribes); again there is once mention made of the Udīchyas (inhabitants of the north); and lastly, the (southern) Nishadhas are once alluded to in the name of their king, Nala Naishadha (or, as he is here called, Naishidha). From this the remaining *kāṇḍas*—the sixth to the tenth—differ palpably enough. They recognise Śāṇḍilya as the final authority † instead of Yājñavalkya, whom they do not even name; neither do they mention any but north-western races, viz., the Gandhāras with their king Nagnajit, the Salvās, and the Kekayas.‡ May not the above-mentioned Vauśa apply not only to the tenth book, but to these five *kāṇḍas*? Since the latter treat specially of the fire-ritual, of the erection of the sacred fire-altars, their possible north-

* The fact that this is so clear may easily account for the circumstance that the Purāṇas have here for once a statement in conformity with fact, as they cite Yājñavalkya as the author of the White Yajus. We may here mention that the name of Yājñavalkya occurs nowhere else in Vedic literature, which might be explained partly by the difference of locality, partly by his having edited the White Yajus after the text of the other Vedas had been fixed; though the latter reason seems insufficient, since other teachers of the White Yajus are mentioned frequently in later Vedic literature, as, for instance, Āruṇi, Śvetaketu, Satyakāma Jābāla, &c., who are either his contemporaries, or belong to even

later times. Besides, his patron Janaka is mentioned at least in the Kaushītaky - Upaniṣad. [In two sections of the Kaushītaki-, or, Śāṅkhāyana-Āraṇyaka, which, however, are clearly of very late origin, Yājñavalkya himself is actually cited (9. 7 and 13. 1); but these passages are themselves direct quotations from Śatap. Br. xiv.—In the Gopatha-Br., which shows so many special points of relationship to the Śatapatha, Yājñavalkya is never mentioned.]

† So do the Sāma-Sūtras; Śāṇḍilya is mentioned besides in the Chhāndogyaop. only.

‡ The legend concerning these recurs in the Chhāndogyaop.

western origin might be explained by the fact that the doctrine upon this subject had, though differing from that of the Persa-Aryans, been kept particularly pure in the north-west owing to the proximity of this latter people.* However this may be, whether the north-western origin of the doctrine of these five *kāṇḍas* be well founded or otherwise,¹⁴² they at any rate belong, in their present form, to the same period as (the tenth possibly to a somewhat later period than) the first five *kāṇḍas*. On this point the mention of Aruṇa Aupaveśi, Āruni, Śvetaketu Āruṇeya, and of Indradyumna (in the tenth book), as well as the frequent reprehension of the Charakādhvaryus, is decisive. That the various parts of the Brāhmaṇa were blended together by one arranging hand¹⁴³ is evident in particular from the repeated occurrence of phrases intimating that a subject has already been treated of in an earlier part, or is to be found presented more in detail in a later part. A closer investigation of the various instances where this occurs has not as yet been within my power.

The number of deviations in regard to ritual or readings cited in the Brāhmaṇa is very great. To these regard is had here and there even in the Samhitā itself, two different *mantras* being quoted side by side as equally good. Most frequently the citation of such variations in the Brāhmaṇa is introduced by the words *ity eke*, or *taḍ āhuḥ*; yet pretty often the names of individual teachers are also mentioned, who must here, in part at least, be looked upon as representing the schools which bear their names. Thus in addition to those already named we have: Ashādha Śāvayasa, Barku Vārshṇa, Aupoditeya, Pāñchi, Takshan, Jīvala Chailaki, Āsuri, Mādhuki, Kahoda Kaushītaki, Vārshṇya Sātyayajna, Sātyayajni, Tāṇḍya, Budila Āsvatārāśvi,

* Ought we to bring the Śākyanins into direct connection with the latter? But then what would become of the connection between Śākyanya (in the Maitrīyaṇi-Upanishad) and the Śākyas? (1).

¹⁴² See on this my detailed discussion in *I. St.*, xiii. 265-269, where I call special attention to various differences in point of language between books I.-V. and VI.-IX.

¹⁴³ The strong censure passed upon the residents on the seven western rivers in ix 3. 1. 24 must be ascribed

Rāma Aupatasvini, Kaukústa, Máhitthi, Muḍimbha* Audanya, Saumápau Mánutantavyau, Satyakāma Jábāla, Śailáli, &c. Besides the Charakádhvaryus, Bhállaveya in particular is regularly censured, from which I conclude, as already stated (p. 95), that the Bhállavi-Bráhmaṇa should be reckoned among those of the Black Yajus. By the "*eke*," where these are found fault with, we should probably also understand (*e.g.*, once for certain in the first *kāṇḍa*) the adherents of the Black Yajus. Once, however (in the eighth *kāṇḍa*), a reading of the Kánva school is quoted by "*eke*" and disputed. How the matter stands in the Bráhmaṇa of the latter as to this passage, whether it finds fault with the reading of the Mádhyamdina school, I am not able to say. A collection of passages of this kind would naturally be of peculiar interest.

The legends interspersed in such numbers throughout the Bráhmaṇa have a special significance. In some of them the language is extremely antiquated, and it is probable therefore that before their incorporation into it they possessed an independent form. The following deserve special mention from their being treated in detail, viz., the legends of the Deluge and the rescue of Manu; of the emigration of Videgha Máthava from the Sarasvatí to the Sadánirá in the country of the Kosala-Videhas; of the restoration to youth of Chyavana by the Aśvins at the request of his wife Sukanyá, the daughter of Śaryáta Mánava; of the contest between Kadrú and Suparñí; of the love and separation of Purúravas and Urvaśí, and others. Many of them reappear as episodes in the epic, in a metrical garb, and often very much altered. It is obvious that we have here a much more intimate connection with the epic than exists in the other Bráhmaṇas. The names Valhika, Janamejaya, and Nagnajit have the most direct reference to the legend of the Mahá-Bhárata; as also the names already discussed above in connection with the Samhitá, Ambá, Ambiká, Ambálíká, Subhadrá, and the use there made of the words *arjuna* and *phalguna*. In any case, we must look for the explanation

* Compare the Muṭibhas in the Mádhuiki (or Paingya), and Kaushítaki are mentioned elsewhere.
Aitar. Br.—Of the above, only Būdila, the Saumápau, Satyakāma,

of this in the circumstance, that this Bráhmaṇa substantially originated and attained its final shape among the tribes of the Kurupañchálas and the neighbouring Kosala-Videhas. The king of the latter, Janaka, who is represented in it as the chief patron of the sacred doctrine it embodies, bears the same name as the father of Sítá and father-in-law of Ráma, in the Rámáyana. This is, however, the only point of contact with the Rámáyana legend which can here be traced, and as the name Janaka seems to have belonged to the whole family, it also virtually disappears. Nevertheless I am inclined to identify the father of Sítá with this exceptionally holy Janaka, being of opinion that Sítá herself is a mere abstraction, and that consequently she had assigned to her the most renowned father possible. As regards the special relation in which the Bráhmaṇa stands to the legend of the Mahá-Bhárata, Lassen, it is well known, takes as the fundamental feature of the latter a conflict between the Kurus and the Pañchálas, ending in their mutual annihilation, the latter being led by the family of the Pándus, who came from the west. Now at the time of the Bráhmaṇa, we find the Kurus and the Pañchálas still in full prosperity,* and also united in the closest bonds of friendship as one people†. Consequently this internecine strife cannot yet have taken place. On the other hand, in the latest portions of the Bráhmaṇa, we find the prosperity, the sin, the expiation, and the fall of Janamejaya Párikshita and his brothers Bhímasena, Ugrásena, and Śrutasena, and of the whole family of the

pe
M

names. Janamejaya and his brothers, already mentioned, are represented either as great-grandsons of Kuru, or else as the great-grandsons of the Pánduid Arjuna, at whose snake-sacrifice Vaiśampáyana-related the history of the

* Though certainly in the last portions of the Br. the Kosala-Videhas seem to have a certain preponderance; and there had perhaps existed as early as the time of the Samhitá (see p. 114) a certain rivalry between the Kurus and Pañchálas.

† At least I am not able to offer another explanation of the word Kurupañchála; it is, moreover, noteworthy that no name of a king of the Kurupañchálas is ever mentioned. Such names are quoted only for Kauravya- or Páñchála-kings.

great struggle between the Kurus and the Pándus. Adopting the latter view, which appears to be the better warranted, from the fact that the part of the Mahá-Bhárata which contains it is written in prose, and exhibits a peculiarly ancient garb, the supposed great internecine conflict between the Kurus and the Pañchálas, and the dominion of the Pándavas, must have been long past at the time of the Bráhmaṇa. How is this contradiction to be explained? That something great and marvellous had happened in the family of the Párikshitas, and that their end still excited astonishment at the time of the Bráhmaṇa, has already been stated. But what it was we know not. After what has been said above, it can hardly have been the overthrow of the Kurus by the Pañchálas; but at any rate, it must have been deeds of guilt; and indeed I am inclined to regard this as yet unknown 'something' as the basis of the legend of the Mahá-Bhárata.¹⁴⁴ To me it appears absolutely necessary to assume, with Lassen, that the Pándavas did not originally belong to the legend, but were only associated with it at a later time,¹⁴⁵ for not only is there no trace of them anywhere in the Bráhmaṇas or Sūtras, but the name of their chief hero, Arjuna (Phalguna), is still employed here, in the Śatapatha-Bráhmaṇa (and in the Samhitá), as a name of Indra; indeed he is probably to be looked upon as originally identical with Indra, and therefore destitute of any real existence. Lassen further (*I. AK.*, i. 647, ff.) concludes, from what Megasthenes (in Arrian) reports of the Indian Heracles, his sons and his daughter *Haradaia*, and also from other accounts in Curtius, Pliny, and Ptolemy,* that at the time when Megasthenes wrote, the mythical association of Kṛishṇa (?) with the Pándavas already ex-

¹⁴⁴ See *Indian Antiquary*, ii. 58 (1873). I may add the following, as it possibly has a bearing here. Vṛidhadyumna Ábhipratáṛiṇa (see Ait. Br., iii. 48) was cursed by a Brahman on account of improper sacrifice, to the effect that: *imam eva prati samaram Kuravaḥ Kurukshetrách chyo-shyanta iti*, Śáṅkh., xv. 16. 12 (and so it came to pass). For the glorification of the Kauravya king Parikshit the four verses, Śáṅkh. Śr., xii. 17.

1-4 (Ath., xx. 127. 7-10), serve; although in Ait. Br., vi. 22 (Śáṅkh. Br., xxx. 5), they are referred to 'fire' or 'year;' but see Gopatha-Br., xi. 12. Another legend respecting Janamejaya Párikshita is found in the Gopatha-Br., ii. 5.

¹⁴⁵ See my detailed discussion of this in *I. St.*, ii. 402-404.

* Curtius and Pliny wrote in the first, Arrian and Ptolemy in the second century A.D.

isted. But this conclusion, although perhaps in itself probable, is at least not certain;* and even if it were, it would not prove that the Pándavas were at that time already associated with the legend of the Kurus. And if we have really to assign the arrangement of the Mádhyamdína recension (see p. 106) to about the time of Megasthenes, it may reasonably be inferred, from the lack of all mention of the Pándavas in it, that their association with the Kurus had not then been established; although, strictly speaking, this conclusion has weight not so much for the period when the arrangement of the work actually took place, as for the time to which the pieces arranged belong.

As with the epic legends, so also do we find in the Śatapatha-Bráhmaṇa several points of contact with the legends of the Buddhists, on the one hand, and with the later tradition concerning the origin of the Sámkhya doctrine, on the other. First, as regards the latter. Āsuri, the name of one of its chief authorities, is at the same time the name of a teacher frequently mentioned in the Śatapatha-Bráhmaṇa. Again, though only in the Yájñavalkya-kāṇḍa, we have mention of a Kápya Patamchala of the country of the Madras as particularly distinguished by his exertions in the cause of Brahmanical theology; and in his name we cannot but see a reference to Kapila and Patanjali, the traditional founders of the Sámkhya and Yoga systems. As regards the Buddhist legends, the Śákyas of Kapilavastu (whose name may possibly be connected with the Śákáyanins of the tenth *kāṇḍa*, and the Śákáyanya of the
as Gautamas, a
resented among
the Bráhmaṇa.

It is, moreover, the country of the Kosalas and Videhas that is to be looked upon as the cradle of Buddhism.—Śveta-ketu (son of Āruni), one of the teachers most frequently mentioned in the Śatapatha-Bráhmaṇa, is with the Buddhists the name of one of the earlier births of Śákyamuni

* The incest of Hercules with *Harḍala* must certainly be traced to the incest of Prajāpati and his daughter, so often touched on in the Bráhmaṇas. [That Vāsudeva

and Arjuna occur together in Pán., iv. 3. 98, cannot be considered as a proof of their being connected with each other; see *I. St.*, xii. 349, ff.]

(see *Ind. Stud.*, ii. 76, note).—That the *māgadha* of the Samhitā may perhaps also be adduced in this connection is a point that has already been discussed (pp. 111, 112).—The words *arhant* (iii. 4. 1. 3, ff.), *śramana* (Vṛih. Ār., iv. 1. 22, as well as Taitt. Ār., ii. 7, beside *tāpasa*), *mahābrāhmaṇa** (Vṛih. Ār., ii. 1. 19. 22), and *pratibuddha*, although by no means used in their Buddhistic technical sense, yet indicate how this gradually arose.—The name Chelaka also in the Brāhmaṇa may possibly have some connection with the peculiarly Buddhistic sense attached to the word *chela*. Ajātaśatru and Brahmadata,† on the contrary, are probably but namesakes of the two persons designated by the Buddhists under these names as contemporaries of Buddha (?). The same probably also applies to the Vātsīputriyas of the Buddhists and the Vātsīputras of the Vṛih. Ārany. (v. 5. 31), although this form of name, being uncommon, perhaps implies a somewhat closer connection. It is, however, the family of the Kātyāyanas, Kātyāyanīputras, which we find represented with special frequency among the Buddhists as well as in the Brāhmaṇa (although only in its very latest portions). We find the first mention‡ of this name in the person of one of the wives of Yājñavalkya, who is called Kātyāyanī, both in the Madhu-kāṇḍa and the Yājñavalkya-kāṇḍa; it also appears frequently in the lists of teachers, and almost the whole of the Sūtras belong-

* Beside *mahārāja*, which is found even earlier, i. 5. 3. 21, ii. 5. 4. 9.

† With the surname Chaikitāneya Vṛih. Ār. Mādhy., i. 1. 26.—In Mahā-Bhārata, xii. 5136, 8603, a *Pāṇchājyō rājā* named Brahmadata is mentioned, who reigned in Kāmpīlya.—Chaikitāneya is to be distinguished from Chaikitāyana in the Chhāndogyaopan., iii. 8.—[On a curious coincidence of a legend in the Vṛihad-Ār. with a Buddhist legend, see *I. St.*, iii. 156, 157.]

‡ In the tenth book of the Taitt. Ār., Kātyāyana (instead of *ni*) is a name of Durgā; on this use see *I. St.*, ii. 192 [xiii. 422].—In the *Gaṇa-pāṭha* to Pāṇini, Kātyāyana is wanting. [But Kātyāyanī is to be gathered from Pāṇini himself, iv. 1. 18;

see *I. St.*, v. 61, 63, 64. A Kātyāyanīputra Jātukarṇya is quoted in the Śāṅkh. Ār., viii. 10. Patanjali in the Mahābhāṣya mentions several Kātyas (*I. St.*, xiii. 399, 407), and indeed the *vārttikakāra* directly belongs to this family. In no other Vedic texts have I found either the Katas or the Kātyas, Kātyāyanas, excepting in the *pravara* section appended at the end of the Āśvalāyana-Srauta-Sūtra, xii. 13–15, in which the Katas and the patronymic, Kātya, are mentioned several times. The Kuru-Katas are cited in the *gaṇa* 'Garga,' and the family of the Katas seems therefore to have been specially connected with the Kurus; see *I. St.*, i. 227, 228.]

ing to the White Yajus bear this name as that of their author.

The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa has been commented in the Mādhyamdina recension by Harisvāmin and Sāyaṇa; but their commentaries are so far extant only in a fragmentary form.¹⁴⁸ The Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka has been explained by Dviveda Gaṅga (of Gujarāt); and in the Kāṇva recension by Śaṃkara, to whose commentary a number of other works by his pupils, &c., attach themselves. As yet only the first *kāṇḍa* with extracts from . . .

with Śaṃkara's commentary and a gloss thereon.¹⁴⁹

I now turn to the *Sūtras* of the White Yajus. The first of these, the *Śrauta-Sūtra* of *Kātyāyana*, consists of twenty-six *adhyāyas*, which on the whole strictly observe the order of the Brāhmaṇa. The first eighteen correspond to its first nine *kāṇḍas*; the Sautrāmaṇi is treated of in the nineteenth, the horse sacrifice in the twentieth *adhyāya*; the twenty-first contains the human, universal, and Manes sacrifices. The next three *adhyāyas* refer, as before stated (p. 80), to the ceremonial of the Sāmaveda, to its several *ekāhas*, *ahīnas*, and *sattras*; yet they rather specify these in the form of lists than present, as the other *adhyāyas* do, a clear picture of the whole sacrificial proceedings. The twenty-fifth *adhyāya* treats of the *prūyaśchittas*, or expiatory ceremonies, corresponding to the first part of the twelfth *kāṇḍa*; and lastly, the twenty-sixth *adhyāya* contains the *pravargya* sacrifice, corresponding to the first part of the fourteenth *kāṇḍa*—Only a few teachers are cited by name, and among these are two belonging to authors of *Sūtras* of the Black Yajus, viz., Laṅgākṣhi and Bhāradvāja; besides whom, only Jātūkarnya, Vātsya, Bādari, Kāśa-

¹⁴⁸ And in very bad manuscripts

¹⁴⁷ The 1st fasciculus was published in 1855. A translation of the first book, and also of some legends specially mentioned above, is printed in vol. I. of my *Indische Streifen* (1868).

¹⁴⁹ Roer's translation (1836) includes the commentary of the first *adhyāya*; he also gives several extracts from it in the subsequent chapters.

kritsni, and Kārshnājini are named. We meet with the three last of these elsewhere only¹⁴⁹ in the Vedānta-Sūtra of Bādarāyaṇa, Bādari excepted, who appears also in the Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra of Jaimini. Vātsya is a name which occasionally occurs in the Vaṅsas of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa;¹⁵⁰ and the same applies to Játúkarnya, who appears in the Vaṅsa of the Madhu- and Yājñavalkya-kāṇḍas in the Kāṇva recension as a pupil of Āsurāyaṇa and of Yáska. (In the Mādhyamdina recension, another teacher intervenes between the last-named and Játúkarnya, viz., Bháradvája.) He is also mentioned in the Aitareya-Āraṇyaka, and repeatedly in the Prátiśákhya-Sūtra of the White Yajus. Besides these, “*eke*” are frequently quoted, whereby reference is made to other Śákhás. One passage gives expression to a certain hostility towards the descendants of the daughter of Atri (the Háleyas, Váleyas, Kaudreyas, Śaubhreyas, Vámarathyas, Gopavanas); while the descendants of Atri himself are held in especial honour. A similar hostility is exhibited in other passages towards the descendants of Kāṇva, Kaśyapa, and Kautsa; yet these three words, according to the commentaries, may also be taken as appellatives, *kāṇva* as “deaf,” *kaśyapa* as “having black teeth” (*śyáavadanta*), and *kautsa* as “doing blamable things.” The first *adhyāya* is of peculiar interest, as it gives the *paribhāshás*, or general rules for the sacrificial ceremonial. Otherwise this work, being entirely based upon the Brāhmaṇa, and therefore in no way an independent production, contains but few data throwing light upon its probable age. Amongst such we may reckon in particular* the circumstance that the word *viśaya*, “conquest,” *sc.* of the

¹⁴⁹ Káśakritsni appears as a grammarian also; he is possibly even earlier than Pāṇini; see *I. Śt.*, xiii. 398, 413. On a Vedic commentator Káśakritsna, see above, pp. 42; 91.

¹⁵⁰ In addition to this there is quoted in ix. 5. 1. 62 the opinion of a teacher bearing this name; a Vātsa is mentioned in the Aitar. Ār. and Śāṅkh. Ār.

* The use of *maṇi*, xx. 7. 1, to denote 101, may also be instanced as

pointing to later times; it belongs to the same class as *agni* = 3, *bhū* = 1, &c. [This is wrong; a little before, in xx. 5. 16, mention is made of 101 *maṇis*, and in xx. 7. 1 we have simply a reference back to this. We might rather cite *gáyatrísampanná*, &c., xx. 11. 21, ff., in the sense of 24, &c., but there is this material difference from the later use, that it is not *gáyatrí* alone which means 24, but *gáyatrísampanna*.]

points of the compass,* is once used in the sense of "the points of the compass" themselves (xx. 4. 26), which evidently—probably yāyas relating—the richest

in this kind of data. They treat, for instance, like the Sāma-Sūtras, of the sacrifices on the Sarasvatī, and also of the Vratya-sacrifices, at which we find the *Māgadhadēśīya brahmabandhu* (xxii. 4. 22) occupying the same position as in *Lātyāyana*.

The Kātyāyana-Sūtra has had many commentators, as Yāsoḡa,¹⁵¹ Pitribhūti, Karka (quoted by Sāyana, and therefore prior to him¹⁵²), Bhartṛiyajna, Śrī-Ananta, Devayājnika (or Yājñikadeva), and Mahādeva. The works of the three last,† and that of Karka are, however, the only ones

The text, with extracts from the third part of my book on this Sūtra a multitude

* See Lassen, *J. AK.*, i. 542. [According to the *St. Petersburg Dictionary*, the word in the above passage should only mean 'gain, the thing conquered, booty'; but a reference to locality is made certain by the parallel passage, *Lāty.*, ix. 10 17: *ṣijitāya id madhve yajet* (yo yasya deśo ṣijitah syāt, as tasya m. y); for the *dyvayajna*, it is true, we do not gain anything by this passage.]

¹⁵¹ This name must be read Yāsoḡopi; see my edition, *Introd.*, p. vii.

¹⁵² A *Dhūmrđyanasagotra Karkādhyaṭpaka* occurs in an inscription published by Dawson in *Journal R. A. S.*, i. 283 (1865), of Śrīdattakalīn (Prāśastarāja), dated sam. 380 (but of what era?)

† [They are, however, incomplete, in part exceedingly so.] The earliest MS. hitherto known of the *yājñikadeva* is dated samvat 1639. —I have given the names of these commentators in the order in which they are cited by one another; no doubt there were other commentators also preceding Yāsoḡa [Yāsoḡopi]. In the Fort William

Catalogue, under No. 742, a com-

mentary by Karka, Pitribhūti, Yāsoḡopi, Bhartṛiyajna. They are so cited by Ananta, who himself seems to have lived in the first half of the sixteenth century, provided he be really identical with the Śrīmadanantākhyachāturmāsyaājñin, whom Nārāyaṇa, the author of the *Mubūrtamārtanda*, mentions as his father; see my Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., No. 879. Deva on i. 10. 13 quotes a Nārāyaṇabhāṣya; might not Ananta's son be its author?

¹⁵³ This part was published 1856-59; Deva's *Paddhati* to books i.-v. is there given in full, also his commentary on book i.; the extracts from the scholia to books ii.-xi. are likewise taken from Deva's commentary: those to books ii.-v. there exhibit, as to style, some differences from the original wording, resulting from abbreviations; the extracts for books xi.-xxvi. come from the scholium of Karka and from an ano-

Yajus also (according to the Charaṇavyúha) derived its name. The word Pāraskara is used as a *saṃjñā*, or proper name—but, according to the *gāṇa*, to denote a district—in the Sūtra of Pāṇini; but I am unable to trace it in Vedic literature. To this Grihya-Sūtra there are still extant a Paddhati by Vāsudeva, a commentary by Jayarāma, and above all a most excellent commentary by Rāmakrishṇa under the title of *Saṃskāra-gaṇapati*, which ranks above all similar works from its abundant quotations and its very detailed and exhaustive handling of the various subjects. In the introduction, which deals with the Veda in general and the Yajurveda in particular, Rāmakrishṇa declares that the Kāṇva school is the best of those belonging to the Yajus.—Under the name of Pāraskara there exists also a Smṛiti-Śāstra, which is in all probability based upon this Grihya-Sūtra. Among the remaining Smṛiti-Śāstras, too, there are a considerable number whose names are connected with those of teachers of the White Yajus; for instance, Yājñavalkya, whose posteriority to Manu quite corresponds to the posteriority of the White Yajus to the Black Yajus—and no doubt also to that of the Kāṭiya-Sūtra to the Mānava-Sūtra;—further, Kātyāyana (whose work, however, as we saw, connects itself with the Sāmaveda), Kaṇva, Gautama, Śāṇḍilya, Jābali, and Parāśara. The last two names appear among the schools of the White Yajus specified in the Charaṇavyúha, and we also find members of their families named in the Vaṅśas of the Śatapatha-Brahmaṇa, where the family of the Parāśaras is particularly often represented*.

The *Prātiśākhya-Sūtra* of the White Yajus, as well as its Anukramāṇī, names at its close Kātyāyana as its author. In the body of the work there is mention, first, of three grammarians, whom we also find cited in the *Prātiśākhya* of the Rik, in Yāska, and in Pāṇini, viz., Śākaṭāyana, Śākalya, and Gārgya; next, of Kāśyapa, likewise mentioned by Pāṇini; and, lastly, of Dālbyha, Jātūkarnya, Śaunaka (the author of the Rik-*Prātiśākhya*?), Aupaśivi,

* [See *J. St.*, i. 156.] Pāṇini, iv. 3. 110 (a rule which possibly does not belong to him), attributes to a Pāraskara a Bhikṣu-Sūtra, i.e., a compendium for religious mendicants.

[The *Parāśarino Bhikṣavaḥ* are mentioned in the *Mahābhāṣya* also, and besides a Kalpa by Parāśara; see *J. St.*, xiii. 340, 445.]

Kāṇva, and the Mādhyamīnas. The distinction in i. 1. 18, 19 between *veda* and *bhāṣya*, i.e., works in *bhāṣā*, —which corresponds to the use of the latter word in Pāṇini, —has already been mentioned (p. 57). The first of the eight *adhyāyas* contains the *saṃjñās* and *paribhāṣās*, i.e., technical terms* and general preliminary remarks. The second *adhy.* treats of the accent; the third, fourth, and fifth of *saṃskāra*, i.e., of loss, addition, alteration, and constancy of the letters with reference to the laws of euphony; the sixth of the accent of the verb in the sentence, &c.; the eighth contains a table of the vowels and consonants, lays down rules on the manner of reading¹⁵⁶ (*svādhyāya*), and gives a division of words corresponding to that of Yāska. Here, too, several *śloka*s are quoted referring to the deities of the letters and words, so that I am almost inclined to consider this last *adhyāya* (which is, moreover, strictly speaking, contained in the first) as a later addition.† We have an excellent commentary on this work by Ūvāta, who has been repeatedly mentioned, under the title of *Mātrimodaka*.¹⁵⁷

The *Anukramanī* of Kātyāyana contains, in the first place, in the first four *adhyāyas* (down to iv. 9), an index of the authors, deities, and metres of the several *śuklānī yajūṇishī* "White Yajus-formulas" contained in the "*Mādhyamīnīye Vājasaneyake Yajurvedamndye sarve* [?] *sakhile saśukriye*," which the saint Yājñavalkya received from Vivasvant, the sun-god. For their *vinīyoga*, or liturgical use, we are referred to the *Kalpakāra*. As regards the names of authors here mentioned, there is much to be remarked. The authors given for the *richas* usually agree with those assigned to the same verses in the *Rig-anukramanī*; there are, however, many exceptions to this. Very often the particular name appears (as is also the case in

* Among them *tīñ*, *kṛit*, *taddhita*, and *upadhā*, terms quite agreeing with Pāṇini's terminology.

¹⁵⁶ Rather: 'reciting;' because here too we must dismiss all idea of writing and reading.

† In that case the mention of the Mādhyamīnas would go for nothing.

¹⁵⁷ In connection with my edition of this *Prātisākhya*, text and trans-

lation, with critical introduction and explanatory notes, in *I. St.*, iv. 65-160, 177-331, Goldstücker in his *Pāṇini*, pp. 186-207, started a special controversy, in which *inter alia* he attempts in particular to show that the author of this work is identical with the author of the *vārttikas* to Pāṇini; see my detailed rejoinder in *I. St.*, v. 91-124.

the Rig-anukramanī) to be borrowed from some word occurring in the verse. In the case where a passage is repeated elsewhere, as very often happens, it is frequently assigned to an author different from the one to whom it had previously been attributed. Many of the Rishis here mentioned do not occur among those of the Rik, and belong to a later stage than these; among them are several even of the teachers mentioned in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. The closing part of the fourth *adhyāya** contains the dedication of the verses to be recited at particular ceremonies to their respective Rishis, deities, and metres, together with other similar mystical distributions. Lastly, the fifth *adhyāya* gives a short analysis of the metres which occur. In the excellent but unfortunately not altogether complete Paddhati of Śrīhala to this Anukramanī we find the liturgical use of each individual verse also given in detail.

The Yajus recension of the three works called Vedāṅgas, viz., Śikshā, Chhandas, and Jyotisha, has already been discussed (p. 60)†

We come now to the *Atharvaveda*.

The *Samhitā* of the Atharvaveda contains in twenty *kāṇḍas*¹⁵³ and thirty-eight *prapāṭhakas* nearly 760 hymns and about 6000 verses. Besides the division into *prapāṭhakas*, another into *anuvākas* is given, of which there are

* Published together with the fifth *adhyāya*, and the beginning of the work, in my edition of the Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā, introduction, pp. lv-lviii.

† For particulars I refer to my Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., pp. 96-100 [and to my editions, already mentioned, of these three tracts].

¹⁵³ This division of the Ath. S.

into twenty books is attested for the period of the author of the *śrīttīkās*, and also by the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa i. 8; see *J. St.*, xiii. 433; whereas both the Ath. S. itself (19. 22, 23) and the Ath. Par. 48. 4-6 still contain the direct intimation that it formerly consisted of sixteen books only; see *J. St.*, iv. 432-434.

Kāṇva, and the Mādhyamīdinas. The distinction in i. 1. 18, 19 between *veda* and *bhāṣya*, i.e., works in *bhāṣā*, —which corresponds to the use of the latter word in Pāṇini, —has already been mentioned (p. 57). The first of the eight *adhyāyas* contains the *saṃjñās* and *paribhāṣās*, i.e., technical terms* and general preliminary remarks. The second *adhy.* treats of the accent; the third, fourth, and fifth of *saṃskāra*, i.e., of loss, addition, alteration, and constancy of the letters with reference to the laws of euphony; the sixth of the accent of the verb in the sentence, &c.; the eighth contains a table of the vowels and consonants, lays down rules on the manner of reading¹⁵⁶ (*svādhyāya*), and gives a division of words corresponding to that of Yāska. Here, too, several *śloka*s are quoted referring to the deities of the letters and words, so that I am almost inclined to consider this last *adhyāya* (which is, moreover, strictly speaking, contained in the first) as a later addition.† We have an excellent commentary on this work by Uvāṭa, who has been repeatedly mentioned, under the title of *Mātrīmodaka*.¹⁵⁷

The *Anukramanī* of Kātyāyana contains, in the first place, in the first four *adhyāyas* (down to iv. 9), an index of the authors, deities, and metres of the several *sūklāṇi yajūṇiṣi* “White Yajus-formulas” contained in the “*Mādhyamīdiniye Vājasaneyake Yajurvedāmnāye sarve* [?] *sakhile saśukriye*,” which the saint Yājñavalkya received from Vivasvant, the sun-god. For their *vinīyoga*, or liturgical use, we are referred to the *Kalpakāra*. As regards the names of authors here mentioned, there is much to be remarked. The authors given for the *richas* usually agree with those assigned to the same verses in the *Rig-anukramanī*; there are, however, many exceptions to this. Very often the particular name appears (as is also the case in

* Among them *tiṇ*, *kṛit*, *taddhita*, and *upadhā*, terms quite agreeing with Pāṇini’s terminology.

¹⁵⁶ Rather: ‘reciting;’ because here too we must dismiss all idea of writing and reading.

† In that case the mention of the Mādhyamīdinas would go for nothing.

¹⁵⁷ In connection with my edition of this *Pratīśākhya*, text and trans-

lation, with critical introduction and explanatory notes, in *I. St.*, iv. 65–160, 177–331, Goldstücker in his *Pāṇini*, pp. 186–207, started a special controversy, in which *inter alia* he attempts in particular to show that the author of this work is identical with the author of the *vārttikas* to Pāṇini; see my detailed rejoinder in *I. St.*, v. 91–124.

the Rīg-anukramanī) to be borrowed from some word occurring in the verse. In the case where a passage is repeated elsewhere, as very often happens, it is frequently assigned to an author different from the one to whom it had previously been attributed. Many of the Rishis here mentioned do not occur among those of the Rik, and belong to a later stage than these; among them are several even of the teachers mentioned in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. The closing part of the fourth *adhyāya** contains the dedication of the verses to be recited at particular ceremonies to their respective Rishis, deities, and metres, together with other similar mystical distributions. Lastly, the fifth *adhyāya* gives a short analysis of the metres which occur. In the excellent but unfortunately not altogether complete Paddhati of Śrīhala to this Anukramanī we find the liturgical use of each individual verse also given in detail.

The Yajus recension of the three works called Vedāṅgas, viz, Śikshā, Chhandas, and Jyotisha, has already been discussed (p. 60) †

We come now to the *Atharvaveda*.

The *Samhitā* of the Atharvaveda contains in twenty *lāṇḍas*¹⁵⁸ and thirty-eight *prapāṭhakas* nearly 760 hymns and about 6000 verses. Besides the division into *prapāṭhakas*, another into *anurākas* is given, of which there are

* Published together with the fifth *adhyāya*, and the beginning of the work, in my edition of the Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā, introduction, pp. lv.-lvi.

† For particulars I refer to my Catalogue of the Berlin MSS, pp. 96-100 [and to my editions, already mentioned, of these three tracts].

¹⁵⁸ This division of the Ath. S.

into twenty books is attested for the period of the Atharvaveda.

both the Ath. S. itself (19. 22, 23) and the Ath. Par. 48. 4-6 still contain the direct intimation that it formerly consisted of sixteen books only; see *J. St.*, iv. 432-434.

Kāṇva, and the Mādhyamīdinas. The distinction in i. 1. 18, 19 between *veda* and *bhāṣhya*, i.e., works in *bhāṣhā*,—which corresponds to the use of the latter word in Pāṇini,—has already been mentioned (p. 57). The first of the eight *adhyāyas* contains the *saṃjñās* and *paribhāṣās*, i.e., technical terms* and general preliminary remarks. The second *adhy.* treats of the accent; the third, fourth, and fifth of *saṃskāra*, i.e., of loss, addition, alteration, and constancy of the letters with reference to the laws of euphony; the sixth of the accent of the verb in the sentence, &c.; the eighth contains a table of the vowels and consonants, lays down rules on the manner of reading¹⁵⁶ (*svādhyāya*), and gives a division of words corresponding to that of Yāska. Here, too, several *śloka*s are quoted referring to the deities of the letters and words, so that I am almost inclined to consider this last *adhyāya* (which is, moreover, strictly speaking, contained in the first) as a later addition.† We have an excellent commentary on this work by Uvāṇa, who has been repeatedly mentioned, under the title of *Mātrimodaka*.¹⁵⁷

The *Anukramanī* of Kātyāyana contains, in the first place, in the first four *adhyāyas* (down to iv. 9), an index of the authors, deities, and metres of the several *śuklānī yajūṇishī* "White Yajus-formulas" contained in the "*Mādhyamīdīnye Vājasaneyake Yajurvedāmnāye sarve* [?] *sakhile saśukriye*," which the saint Yājñavalkya received from Vivasvant, the sun-god. For their *vinīyoga*, or liturgical use, we are referred to the *Kalpakāra*. As regards the names of authors here mentioned, there is much to be remarked. The authors given for the *ṛichas* usually agree with those assigned to the same verses in the *Rig-anukramanī*; there are, however, many exceptions to this. Very often the particular name appears (as is also the case in

* Among them *tiñ*, *kṛit*, *taddhita*, and *upadhā*, terms quite agreeing with Pāṇini's terminology.

¹⁵⁶ Rather: 'reciting,' because here too we must dismiss all idea of writing and reading.

† In that case the mention of the Mādhyamīdinas would go for nothing.

¹⁵⁷ In connection with my edition of this *Pratīśākhya*, text and trans-

lation, with critical introduction and explanatory notes, in *I. St.*, iv. 65–160, 177–331, Goldstücker in his *Pāṇini*, pp. 186–207, started a special controversy, in which *inter alia* he attempts in particular to show that the author of this work is identical with the author of the *vṛttikas* to Pāṇini; see my detailed rejoinder in *I. St.*, v. 91–124.

the Rig-anukramanī) to be borrowed from some word occurring in the verse. In the case where a passage is repeated elsewhere, as very often happens, it is frequently assigned to an author different from the one to whom it had previously been attributed. Many of the Rishis here mentioned do not occur among those of the Rik, and belong to a later stage than these; among them are several even of the teachers mentioned in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. The closing part of the fourth *adhyāya** contains the dedication of the verses to be recited at particular ceremonies to their respective Rishis, deities, and metres, together with other similar mystical distributions. Lastly, the fifth *adhyāya* gives a short analysis of the metres which occur. In the excellent but unfortunately not altogether complete Paddhati of Śrīhala to this Anukramanī we find the liturgical use of each individual verse also given in detail.

The Yajus recension of the three works called Vedāṅgas, viz, Śikshā, Chhandas, and Jyotisha, has already been discussed (p. 60) †

We come now to the *Atharvaveda*.

The *Samhitā* of the Atharvaveda contains in, twenty *laṅḍas*¹⁵³ and thirty-eight *prapāṭhakas* nearly 760 hymns and about 6000 verses. Besides the division into *prapāṭhakas*, another into *anuvākas* is given, of which there are

* Published together with the fifth *adhyāya*, and the beginning of the work, in my edition of the Vājasaneyi-Samhitā, introduction, pp. lv.-lviii.

† For particulars I refer to my Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., pp. 96-100 [and to my editions, already mentioned, of these three tracts].

¹⁵³ This division of the Ath. S.

into twenty books is attested for the period of the author of the *śruti*ikas, and also by the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa I. 8; see *I. St.*, xiii. 433; whereas both the Ath. S. itself (19. 22, 23) and the Ath. Par. 48. 4-6 still contain the direct intimation that it formerly consisted of sixteen books only; see *I. St.*, iv. 432-434.

some ninety. The division into *parvans*, mentioned in the thirteenth book of the *Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, does not appear in the manuscripts; neither do they state to what school the existing text belongs. As, however, in one of the *Parīśishtas* to be mentioned hereafter (the seventh), the *ṛichas* belonging to the ceremony there in question are quoted as *Paippalāda mantrāḥ*, it is at least certain that there was a *Samhitā* belonging to the *Paippalāda* school, and possibly this may be the *Samhitā* now extant.¹⁵⁹ Its contents and principle of division are at present unknown¹⁶⁰ in their details. We only know generally that "it principally contains formulas intended to protect against the baneful influences of the divine powers,* against diseases and noxious animals; cursings of enemies, invocations of healing herbs; together with formulas for all manner of occurrences in every-day life, prayers for protection on journeys, luck in gaming, and the like"†—all matters for which analogies enough are to be found in the hymns of the *Ṛik-Samhitā*. But in the *Ṛik* the instances are both less numerous, and, as already remarked in the introduction (p. 11), they are handled in an entirely different manner, although at the same time a not inconsiderable portion of these songs reappears directly in the *Ṛik*, particularly in the tenth *maṇḍala*.* As to the ceremonial for which the hymns of the *Ātharvan* were used, what corre-

¹⁵⁹ According to a tract recently published by Roth, *Der Atharvaveda in Kashmir* (1875), this is not the case; the extant *Samhitā* seems rather to belong to the school of the *Saunakas*, whilst the *Paippalāda-Samhitā* has come down to us in a second recension, still preserved in Kashmir.

¹⁶⁰ The arrangement in books i.-vii. is according to the number of verses in the different pieces; these have, on an average, four verses in book i., five in ii., six in iii., seven in iv., eight to eighteen in v., three in vi., and only one in vii. Books viii.-xiii. contain longer pieces. As to the contents, they are indiscriminately mixed up. Books xiv.-xviii., on the contrary, have all a uniform subject-matter; xiv. treats of mar-

riage, xv. of the glorification of *Vrātya*, xvi., xvii. of certain conjurations, xviii. of burial and the festival of the *Manes*. Book xix. is a mixture of supplementary pieces, part of its text being in a rather corrupt condition; book xx. contains,—with one peculiar exception, the so-called *kuntāpasukta*,—only complete hymns addressed to *Indra*, which are borrowed directly and without change from the *Rigveda*. Neither of these two last books is noticed in the *Atharva-Prātiśākhya* (see note 167), and therefore they did not belong to the original text at the time of this work.

* Of the stars, too, i.e., of the lunar asterisms.

† See Roth, *Zur Litt. und Gesch. des Veda*, p. 12.

East. In time it will certainly be possible, in the Atharva-Samhitá also, to distinguish between pieces that are older and pieces that are more modern, although upon the whole geographical data are of rare occurrence. Its language exhibits many very peculiar forms of words, often in a very antique although *prákrítized* shape. It contains, in fact, a mass of words used by the people, which from lack of occasion found no place in the other branches of the literature. The enumeration of the lunar asterisms in the nineteenth *kāṇḍa* begins with *krittiká*, just as in the Taittiríya-Samhitá, but otherwise it deviates considerably from the latter, and gives for the most part the forms of the names used in later times.¹⁶² No direct determination of date, however, can be gathered from it, as Colebrooke imagined. Of special interest is the mention of the Asura *Kṛishṇa* * *Keśin*, from the slaying of whom *Kṛishṇa* (*Āṅgí-rasa*?, *Devakíputra*) receives the epithets of *Keśihan*, *Keśi-súdana* in the Epic and in the *Purāṇas*. In those hymns which appear also in the *Rik-Samhitá* (mostly in its last *maṇḍala*), the variations are often very considerable, and these readings seem for the most part equally warranted with those of the *Rik*. There are also many points of contact with the *Yajus*.

The earliest mention of the Atharvan-songs occurs under the two names "*Atharváṇas*" and "*Āṅgírasas*," names which belong to the two most ancient *Rishi*-families, or to the common ancestors of the Indo-Aryans and the Persa-Aryans, and which are probably only given to these songs in order to lend all the greater authority and holiness to the incantations, &c., contained in them.† They are also often specially connected with the ancient family of the *Bhrigus*.¹⁶³ Whether we have to take the "*Athar-*

¹⁶² The piece in question proves, on special grounds, to be a later supplement; see *I. St.*, iv. 433, n.

* An Asura *Kṛishṇa* we find even in the *Rik-Samhitá*, and he plays a prominent part in the Buddhist legends (in which he seems to be identified with the *Kṛishṇa* of the epic (?)).

† See *I. St.*, i. 295, ff. That these names indicate any Persa-Aryan influence is not to be thought of;

and if, according to the *Bhavishya-Purāṇa* (Wilson in Reinaud's *Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 394), the *Parsis* (*Magas*) have four Vedas, the *Vada* (! *Yásna*?), *Viśvavada* (*Viśpered*), *Vidut* (*Vendidad*), and *nígirasa*, this is a purely Indian view, though indeed very remarkable.

¹⁶³ See my essay *Zwei vedische Texte über Omina und Portenta*, pp. 346-348.

vānas" in the thirtieth book of the Vāj. Samhitā as Atharvan-songs is not yet certain; but for the period to which the eleventh, thirteenth, and fourteenth books of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, as well as the Chhândogyaopaniṣad and the Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka (ii and viii), belong, the existence of the Atharvan-songs and of the Atharvaveda is fully established by the mention of them in these works. The thirteenth book of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa even mentions a division into *parvans*,* which, as already remarked, no longer appears in the manuscripts. In the eighth book of the Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka, the *ādeśa*, i.e., the Brāhmaṇa, is inserted between the three other Vedas and the "Atharvāṅgrasas." Besides these notices, I find the Atharvaveda, or more precisely the "Atharvanikas," only mentioned in the Nidāna-Sūtra of the Sāmaveda (and in Pāṇini). The names, too, which belong to the schools of the Atharvaveda appear nowhere in Vedic literature,† with the exception perhaps of Kauśika; still, this patronymic does not by any means involve a special reference to the Atharvan‡. Another name, which is, however, only applied to the Atharvaveda in the later Atharvan-writings themselves, viz., in the Pariśiṣtas, is "Brahma-veda." This is explained by the circumstance that it claims to be the Veda for the chief sacrificial priest, the Brahman,¹⁶⁴ while the other Vedas are represented as those of his assistants only, the Hotar, Udgātar, and Adhvaryu,

* Corresponding to the *sūktas*, *anurūpas*, and *śaśats* of the Rik, Yajus, and Sāman respectively.

† Members of the family of the Atharvans are now and then mentioned; thus especially Dadhyañch Ath., Kabandha Ath., whom the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa designates as a pupil of Sumantu (the latter we met in the Gṛhya-Sūtras of the Rik, see above, p. 57), and others.

‡ It seems that even in later times the claim of the Atharvan to rank as Veda was disputed. Yājñavalkya (i. 101) mentions the two separately, *redditharra*; though in another passage (i. 44) the "Atharvāṅgrasas" occur along with Rik, Sāman, and Yajus. In Manu's Code we only once find the *fruter*

atharvāṅgrasas, as magic formulas; in the Rāmāyaṇa likewise only once ii. 26. 20 (Gorr.) the *mantrās chdatharvands* (the latter passage I overlooked in *J. St.* i. 297). [In Patanjali's Mahābhāṣya, however, the Atharvan is cited at the head of the Vedas (as in the Rik-Gṛhyas, see above, p. 58), occasionally even as their only representative; see *J. St.* xiii. 431-32.]

¹⁶⁴ This explanation of the name, though the traditional one, is yet very likely erroneous; by *Brahma-veda* (a name which is first mentioned in the Śākh. Gṛhya, i. 16) we have rather to understand 'the Veda of *brahmanī*, of prayers, i.e., here in the narrower sense of 'incantations.' (St. Petersburg Dict.)

—a claim which has probably no other foundation than the circumstance, cleverly turned to account, that there was, in fact, no particular Veda for the Brahman, who was bound to know all three, as is expressly required in the Kaushîtaki-Brâhmana (see *I. St.*, ii. 305). Now the weaker these pretensions are, the more strongly are they put forward in the Atharvan-writings, which indeed display a very great animosity to the other Vedas. Towards one another, too, they show a hostile enough spirit; for instance, one of the Pariśishtas considers a Bhârgava, Paippalâda, and Śaunaka alone worthy to act as priest to the king,* while a Mauda or Jalada as *purohita* would only bring misfortune.

The Atharva-Saṃhitâ also, it seems, was commented upon by Sâyaṇa. Manuscripts of it are comparatively rare on the Continent. Most of them are distinguished by a peculiar mode of accentuation.† A piece of the Saṃhitâ of some length has been made known to us in text and translation by Aufrecht (*I. St.*, i. 121–140); besides this, only some fragments have been published.¹⁶⁵

The Brâhmana-stage is but very feebly represented in the Atharvaveda, viz., by the *Gopatha-Brâhmana*, which, in the manuscript with which I am acquainted (E. I. H., 2142), comprises a *pûrva*- and an *uttara*-portion, each containing five *prapâthakas*; the MS., however, breaks off with the beginning of a sixth (i.e., the eleventh) *prapâ-*

* Yâjñavalkya (i. 312) also requires that such an one be well versed *atharvâṅgirase*.

† Dots are here used instead of lines, and the *svarita* stands mostly beside, not above, the *akshara*.

¹⁶⁵ The whole text has been edited long since (1855–56) by Roth and Whitney. The first two books have been translated by me in *I. St.*, iv. 393–430, and xiii. 129–216, and the nuptial formulas contained in the fourteenth book, together with a great variety of love charms and similar formulas from the remaining books, *ibid.*, v. 204–266. For the criticism of the text see Roth's tract, *Ueber den Atharvaveda* (1856), and *Der Atharvaveda in*

Kashmir (1875). In the *Gopatha-Brâhmana* (i. 29), and in Patanjali's *Mahâbhâshya* (see *I. St.*, xiii. 433; although, according to Burnell, *Introd.* to *Vaṇśa-Brâhmana*, p. xxii, the South Indian MSS. omit the quotation from the Atharvaveda), the beginning of the Saṃhitâ is given otherwise than in our text, as it commences with i. 6, instead of i. 1. It is similarly given by Bhandarkar, *Indian Antiquary*, iii. 132; and two MSS. in Haug's possession actually begin the text in this manner; see Haug's *Brahman und die Brahmanen*, p. 45.—Burnell (*Introd.* to *Vaṇśa-Br.*, p. xxi.) doubts whether the Ath. S. was commented by Sâyaṇa.

thaka. In one of the *Paríśishtas* the work is stated to have originally contained 100 *prapáthakas*. The contents are entirely unknown to me. According to Colebrooke's remarks on the subject, Atharvan is here represented as a *Prajápati* who is appointed by Brahman as a Demiurge; and this is, in fact, the position which he occupies in the *Paríśishtas* and some of the *Upanishads*. The division of the year into twelve (or thirteen) months consisting of 360 days, and of each day into thirty *muhúrtas*, which Colebrooke points out as remarkable, equally appears in the *Bráhmaṇas* of the *Yajus*, &c.¹⁶⁶

Departing from the order hitherto followed I will add here what I have to say about the *Sútras* of the *Atharva-veda*, as these are the only other writings which have reference to the *Samhitá*, whereas the remaining parts of the *Atharvan-literature*, corresponding to the *Aranyakas* of the other *Vedas*, have no reference to it whatever.

In the first place, I have to mention the *Śaunakiyá chatur-adhyáyiká*,^{166b} a kind of *Prátisákhyá* for the *Atharva-Samhitá*, in four *adhyáyas*, which might possibly go back to the author of the *Rik-Prátisákhyá*, who is also mentioned in the *Prátisákhyá* of the *White Yajus*. The *Śaunakas* are named in the *Charaṇavyúha* as a school of the *Atharvan*, and members of this school are repeatedly mentioned in the *Upanishads*. The work bears here and there a more generally grammatical character than is the case with the remaining *Prátisákhyas*. *Śáka-*

¹⁶⁶ M. Muller first gave us some information as to the *Gopatha-Bráhmaṇa* in his *History of A. S. L.*, p. 445-455; and now the work itself has been published by Rájendra Lála Mitra and Harachandra Vidyábhúshana in the *Bibl. Indica* (1870-72). According to this it consists of eleven (i.e., 5+6) *prapáthakas* only. We do not discover in it any special relation to the *Ath. S.*, apart from several references thereto under different names. The contents are a medley, to a large extent derived from other sources. The first half is essentially of speculative, cosmogonic import, and is particularly rich in legends, a good number

of which appear in the same form as in the *Śatapatha-Bráhmaṇa*, xi. xii, and are therefore probably simply copied from it. The second half contains a brief exposition of a variety of points connected with the *Śranta* ritual, specially adapted, as it seems, from the *Aitar. Br.* Very remarkable is the assumption in i. 28 of a *doshapati*, lord of evil (!), who at the beginning of the *Dvāpara* (-yuga) is supposed to have acted as '*ṛishínám cladesak*.' This reminds us of, and doubtless rests upon, the *Māra* of the Buddhists.

^{166b} The form of name in the MS. is: *chaturadhyáyika*.

To this Sūtra belong further five so-called *Kalpas*: the *Nakshatra-Kalpa*, an astrological compendium relating to the lunar mansions, in fifty *kaṇḍikās*; the *Śānti-Kalpa*, in twenty-five *kaṇḍikās*, which treats likewise of the adoration of the lunar mansions,¹⁷⁰ and contains prayers addressed to them; the *Vitāna-Kalpa*, the *Samhitā-Kalpa*, and the *Abhichāra-Kalpa*. The *Vishnu-Purāna* and the *Charaṇavyūha*, to be presently mentioned, name, instead of the last, the *Aṅgīrasa-Kalpa*. Further, seventy-four smaller *Parīśishtas*¹⁷¹ also belong to it, mostly composed in *ślokas*, and in the form of dialogues, like the *Purānas*. The contents are *Grihya*-subjects of various kinds; astro-

also a *Āraṇya-vyūha*, which states the number of the *richas* in the *Atharva-Samhitā* at 12,380, that of the *paryāyas* (hymns) at 2000; but the number of the *Kauśīkottāni parīśiṣṭāni* only at 70. Of teachers who are mentioned the

Gautama, Kāmkāyana, Karmagha, Pippalāda, Māhaki, Garga, Gārgya, Vṛiddhagarga, Ātreya, Padmayoni, Kraushṭuki. We meet with many of these names again in the astrological literature proper.

I now turn to the most characteristic part of the literature of the Atharvan, viz., the *Upanishads*. Whilst the *Upanishads* κατ' ἐξοχήν so called, of the remaining Vedas all belong to the later, or even the latest, portions of these

¹⁷⁰ An account of the contents of both texts is given in my second essay on the *Nakshatras*, pp. 390-393 (1862); Haug in *I. St.*, ix. 174, mentions an *Aranyaka-Jyotiṣa*, different from the *Nakshatra-Kalpa*.

¹⁷¹ Haug, *l. c.*, speaks of 72; amongst them is found a *Nigbanta*, which is wanting in the Berlin MS. Compare the *Nigama-Parīśiṣṭa* of the White Yajus — Texts of this

kind are quoted even in the *Mahābhāṣya*; see *I. St.*, xiii. 463.

¹⁷² One of the *Parīśishtas* relating to this subject has been communicated by me in *I. St.*, x. 317, ff.; it is the fifty-first of the series. The statements found therein agree with the

Vedas, they at least observe a certain limit which they never transgress, that is to say, they keep within the range of inquiry into the nature of the Supreme Spirit, without serving sectarian purposes. The Atharvan Upanishads, on the contrary, come down as far as the time of the Purāṇas, and in their final phases they distinctly enter the lists in behalf of sectarian views. Their number is as yet undetermined. Usually only fifty-two are enumerated. But as among these there are several which are of quite modern date, I do not see why we should separate these fifty-two Upanishads from the remaining similar tracts which, although not contained in the usual list, nevertheless call themselves Upanishads, or Atharvopaniśhads; more especially as this list varies in part according to the different works where it is found, and as the manuscripts mix up these fifty-two with the remaining Upanishads indiscriminately. Indeed, with regard to the Upanishad literature we have this peculiar state of things, that it may extend down to very recent times, and consequently the number of writings to be reckoned as belonging to it is very considerable. Two years ago, in the second part of the *Indische Studien*, I stated the number at ninety-five, including the Upanishads contained in the older Vedas.* The researches instituted by Walter Elliot in Masulipatam among the Telingana Brahmans on this subject have, however, as Dr. Roer writes to me, yielded the result that among these Brahmans there are

* This number is wrong; it ought to be ninety-three. I there counted the Anandavalli and Bhṛiguavalli twice, first among the twenty-three *Atharvopaniśhads* omitted by Anquetil, and then among the nine Upanishads borrowed from the other Vedas which are found in his work. The number would further have to be reduced to ninety-two, since I cite Colebrooke's Amṛitavindu and Anquetil's Amṛitanāda as distinct Upanishads, whereas in point of fact they are identical; but then, on the other hand, two Upanishads identified by me ought to be kept distinct, viz., Colebrooke's Prāṇāgnihotra and Anquetil's Pranou, the latter (Prāṇa-

vopaniśhad) being different from the former. — The number now here finally arrived at—ninety-six—is obtained (1) by the addition of six new Upanishads, viz., the Bhāllavi-Upanishad, the Samvartop., the second Mahopaniśhad, and three of the Upanishads contained in the Atharvasīras (Ganapati, Sūrya, Devī); (2) by the omission of two, the Rudropanishad and the Atharvāṇīya-Rudropanishad, which are possibly identical with others of those cited; and (3) by counting the Mahanārāyaṇopaniśhad as only one, whereas Colebrooke counts it as two.

123 Upanishads actually extant; and if we include those which they do not possess, but which are contained in my list just referred to, the total is raised to 147.* A list of these 123 is given in two of them, viz., in the *Mahāvākya-muktāvalī* and in the *Muktikopanishad*, and is exactly the same in both. According to the statement given above, there must be among these 123 fifty-two† in all which are wanting in my own list, and these include the two names just mentioned.—A Persian translation made in 1656 of fifty Upanishads is extant in Anquetil du Peron's Latin rendering.

If now we attempt to classify the Upanishads so far known, the most ancient naturally are those (1-12) which are found in the three older Vedas only‡ I have already remarked that these never pursue sectarian aims. A seeming—but only a seeming—exception to this is the *Śatarvādrīya*; for although the work has in fact been used for-sectarian purposes, it had originally quite a different significance, which had nothing to do with the misapplication of it afterwards made; originally, indeed, it was not an Upanishad at all.§ A real exception, however, is the *Śvetāśvataropanishad* (13), which is in any case wrongly classed with the Black Yajus; it is only from its having incorporated many passages of the latter that it has been foisted in here. It belongs to about the same rank and date as the *Kaivalyopanishad*. Nor can the *Maitrāyaṇa-Upanishad* (14) reasonably claim to be ranked with the Black

* According to the previous note, only 145.

† *Muktikopanishad*, see *Journal As. Soc. Eng.*, 1851, p. 607, ff., 108 names are directly cited (and of these 98 are analysed singly in Taylor's *Catalogue* (1860) of the *Oriental MSS. of Fort St. George*, ii. 457-474). But to these other names have to be added which are there omitted; see *I. St.*, iii. 324-326. The alphabetical list published by M. Muller in *Z. D. M. G.*, xix. 137-158 (1865), brings the number up to 149 (170, Burnell, *Indian Antiquary*, ii. 267)

Since then many new names have been brought to our knowledge by the Catalogues of MSS. published by Burnell, Buhler, Kielhorn, Rājendra Lāla Mitra, Haug (*Brahman and die Brahmanen*, pp. 29-31), &c.; so that at present I count 235 Upanishads, many of which, however, are probably identical with others, as in many cases the names alone are at present known to us.]

‡ Namely, *Aitareya*, *Kaushitaki*, *Vāshkala*, *Chhândogya*, *Śatarvādrīya*, *Śukhārāṇī* or *Taitt. Samhitā*, *Upanishad*, *Chhândogya* (1), *Tadara*, *Śiva*, *Samhitā*, *Purushasūktā*, *Īśā*, *Vijñāna*, *Aranyaka*.

§ See on this *I. St.*, ii. 14-47.

Yajus; it belongs rather, like the Śvetāśvataropāṇishad, only to the Yoga period. Still it does not, at least in the part known to me,¹⁷³ pursue any sectarian aim (see pp. 96-99).

Apart from the two last-named Upanishads, the transition to the Atharvopāṇishads is formed on the one hand by those Upanishads which are found in one of the other three Vedas, as well as in a somewhat modified form in an Atharvan-recension, and on the other hand by those Upanishads of which the Atharvan-recension is the only one extant, although they may have formerly existed in the other Vedas as well. Of the latter we have only one instance, the *Kāthaka-Upanishad* (15, 16); of the former, on the contrary, there are several instances (17-20), viz., *Kcna* (from the Sāmaveda), *Bhriguvalī*, *Ānandavallī*, and *Brihannārāyaṇa* (Taitt. Ār., viii.-ix.).

The Atharvopāṇishads, which are also distinguished externally by the fact that they are mostly composed in verse, may themselves be divided into three distinct classes, which in their beginnings follow the earlier Upanishads with about equal closeness. Those of the first class continue directly to investigate the nature of Atman, or the Supreme Spirit; those of the second deal with the subject of absorption (*yoga*) in meditation thereon, and give the means whereby, and the stages in which, men may even in this world attain complete union with Atman; and lastly, those of the third class substitute for Atman some one of the many forms under which Śiva and Viṣṇu, the two principal gods, were in the course of time worshipped.

Before proceeding to discuss these three classes in their proper order, I have to make some observations on the Atharvan-recensions of those Upanishads which either belong at the same time to the other Vedas also, or at any rate originally did so.

The Atharvan-text of the Kenopāṇishad, in the first place, differs but very little from its Sāman-text. The reason why this Upanishad has been incorporated into the Atharvan collection seems to be the fact that Umā Haimavatī is here (and for the first time) mentioned, as she

¹⁷³ In the remaining parts also there is nothing of the kind to be found.

was probably understood in the sense of the Śiva sects. With the Atharvan-text both of the Ānandavallī and of the Bṛhguvallī* I am unacquainted. Of the Bṛhannārāyanop.† also, which corresponds to the Nārāyaṇīyop. of the Taitt. Āranyaka, only a few data are known to me; these, however, sufficiently show that the more ancient and obscure forms have here throughout been replaced by the corresponding later, and regular ones.‡—The two *Kātharallīs*, for the most part in metrical form, are extant in the Atharvān-text only.§ The second is nothing but a supplement to the first, consisting as it does almost exclusively of quotations from the Vedas, intended to substantiate more fully the doctrines there set forth. The first is based upon a legend (see pp. 92, 93) related in the Taitt. Brāhmaṇa [iii. 11. 8]. Nachiketas, the son of Āruni,|| asks Death for a solution of his doubt whether man exists after death or not. After much reluctance, and after holding out enticements of all kinds, which Nachiketas withstands, Death at length initiates him into the mystery of existence. Life and death, he says, are but two different phases of development; true wisdom consists in the perception of identity with the Supreme Spirit, whereby men are elevated above life and death. The exposition in this first part is really impressive: the diction, too, is for the most part antique. A few passages, which do not harmonise at all with the remainder, seem either to have been inserted at a later time, or else, on the contrary, to have been retained

* Two lists of the Atharvopani-
shads in Chambers's Collection (see
my Catalogue, p. 95) cite after these
two *vallīs* (39, 40), also a *śādhya-vallī*
and an *uttaravallī* (41, 42)!

† By Colebrooke it is reckoned as
two Upanishads.

‡ Thus we have *visasarja* instead
of *īya-cha-sarja*; *Kanyakumārīm* in-
stead of *ṛi*; *Katyāyanyai* instead of
ṛyandya, &c.

§ See *J. St.* ii 195, ff, where the
various translations and editions are
cited. Since then this Upanishad
has appeared in a new edition, with
Sankara's commentary, in the *Bibl.*
Indica, vol. viii., edited by Dr. Roer
[and translated in vol. xv.]

|| Two other names, which are
given to the father of Nachiketas,
viz. Auddālaki and Vājaśravas,
conflict with the usual accounts.
Vājaśravas appears also in the pas-
sage above referred to of the Tai-
ttiṛīya-Brāhmaṇa; whether Auddā-
laka does so likewise I am unable to
say. [Auddālaka is wanting in the
T. Br., as also the whole passage
itself.] Benfey (in the *Göttinger*
Gelehrte Anzeigen, January 1852, p.
129) suggests that we should refer
Auddālaka Āruni to Nachiketas; but
the incompatibility of the two names
is not thereby removed. Ārunis Ud-
dālaka, and Auddālaka is Āruner?

from a former exposition drawn up more for a liturgical purpose. Its polemics against those holding different opinions are very sharp and bitter. They are directed against *tarka*, "doubt," by which the Sámkhyas and Baudhas are here probably intended. The sacredness of the word *om* as the expression for the eternal position of things is very specially emphasised, a thing which has not occurred before in the same way. The gradation of the primeval principles (in iii. 10, 11) exactly corresponds to the system of the deistical Yoga, whereas otherwise the exposition bears a purely Vedántic character.

Of the Atharvopaniśhads proper the *Muṇḍaka*- and *Praśna*-Upaniśhads (21, 22) connect themselves most closely with the Upaniśhads of the older Vedas and with the Vedánta doctrine;¹⁷⁴ indeed, in the Vedánta-Sútra of Bádaráyana reference is made to them quite as often as to these others. The *Muṇḍaka-Upaniśhad*, mostly in verse, and so called because it "shears" away, or frees from, all error, is very like the Káthakop. with regard to doctrine and style; it has, in fact, several passages in common with it. At the outset it announces itself as an almost direct revelation of Brahman himself. For Aṅgiras, who communicates it to Śaunaka, has obtained it from Bháradvāja Satyaváha, and the latter again from Aṅgir,* the pupil of Atharvan, to whom it was revealed by Brah-

¹⁷⁴ The list of the Atharvopaniśhads begins, as a rule, with the *Muṇḍakopaniśhad*; and, according to the statements in Náráyaṇabhaṭṭa's scholium on the smaller Ath. Upaniśhads now being edited (since 1872) in the *Bibl. Indica* by Rámamaya Tarkaratna, a settled order of these Upaniśhads must still have been in existence in the time of Náráyaṇabhaṭṭa, since he denotes the individual Upaniśhads as, e.g., the seventh, the eighth, &c., reckoning from the *Muṇḍaka*. This order is occasionally ascribed by him to the Śaunaka-school. Compare as to this the remarks of Colebrooke, *Misc. Ess.*, i. 93, according to which the first fifteen Upaniśhads only would belong to the Śaunakíyas, and the

following Up. to other Śákhas. But Náráyaṇa, with whom, as regards the order of the first twenty-eight names, Colebrooke agrees in the main (from this point their statements differ), also quotes the *Śaunakagranthavistara* for the Brahmanindu No. 18, and the *Śákha Śaunakavartitá* for the Átmopaniśhad No. 28, as authority for these numbers, or places, of the two Upaniśhads. The Gopálatápani, however, is marked by him as the forty-sixth '*Atharva-Paippalé*,' and the Váśudevopaniśhad as the forty-ninth '*kshudragranthagane*;' see Rájendra Lála Mitra, *Notices of Sanskrit MSS.*, i. 18 (1870).

* Aṅgir is a name which occurs nowhere else.

man himself. Shortly afterwards, Vedic literature is opposed, as the inferior science, to speculation. The former is stated to consist of the four Vedas, and of the six Vedāṅgas, which are singly enumerated. Some manuscripts here insert mention of the *itihāsa-purāṇa-nyāya-mīmāṃsā-dharmaśāstrāṇi*; but this is evidently a later addition. Such additions are also found in other passages of this Upanishad in the manuscripts. This enumeration (here occurring for the first time) of the different Vedāṅgas is of itself sufficient to show that at that time the whole material of the Vedas had been systematically digested, and that out of it a new literature had arisen, which no longer belongs to the Vedic, but to the following period. We may further conclude from the mention of the Tretā in the course of the work that the Yuga-system also had already attained its final form. On the other hand, we here find the words *kālī* (the dark one) and *karālī* (the terrible one) still reckoned among the seven tongues of fire, whereas in the time of the dramatic poet Bhavabhūti (eighth century A.D.) they are names of Durgā—the wife of

from the former meaning to the latter, the Mundakop. must be separated by a very wide interval from the date of Bhavabhūti,—a conclusion which follows besides from the circumstance that it is on several occasions turned to account in the Vedānta-Sūtra, and that it has been commented by Śaṅkara.—The *Praśnopanishad*, in prose, seems to be borrowed from an Atharva-Brāhmaṇa, viz., that of the Pippalāda-school.* It contains the instruction by Pippalāda of six different teachers, amongst whom the

* In the colophons, at least, it is once so described; by Śaṅkara, too, at the beginning of his commentary, it is called *brahmana*, although this proves but little, since with him all the Upanishads he comments pass as *śruti* and *brahmana*.—The name Pippalāda is probably to be traced

the work Hiranyanábha, a prince of the Kośalas, is also mentioned,—the same doubtless who is specially extolled in the Purāṇas. As in the Muṇḍakopan., so here also some interpolated words are found which betray themselves as such by the fact that they are passed over by Śaṃkara in his commentary. They refer to Atharvan himself, and to the half *mātrā* (mora), to which the word *om*, here appearing in its full glory, is entitled in addition to its three moræ (*a*, *u*, *m*), and are evidently a later addition by some one who did not like to miss the mention of these two subjects in an Atharvopanishad, as in these they otherwise invariably occur. Both Muṇḍaka and Praśna have been several times edited and translated, see *I. St.*, i. 280, ff., 439, ff., again recently by Dr. Roer in vol. viii. of the *Bibliotheca Indica* together with Śaṃkara's commentary.¹⁷⁵—The name of Pippalāda is borne by another Upanishad, the *Garbha-Upanishad* (23), which I add here for this reason, although in other respects this is not quite its proper place. Its contents differ from those of all the other Upanishads, and relate to the human body, to its formation as embryo and the various parts of which it is composed, and the number and weight of these. The whole is a commentary on a *tri-ṣṭubh* strophe prefixed to it, the words of which are passed in review singly and further remarks then subjoined. The mention of the names of the seven musical notes of the present day, as well as of the weights now in use (which are found besides in Varāha Mihira), brings us to a tolerably modern date; so also the use of Devadatta in the sense of *Caius*. A few passages in which, among other things, mention is made, for instance, of Nārāyaṇa as Supreme Lord, and of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga as the means of attaining knowledge of him, reappear in the fourteenth book—a supplementary one—of Yāska's Nirukti. Whether Śaṃkara expounded this Upanishad is as yet uncertain. It is translated in *Ind. Stud.*, ii. 65–71.¹⁷⁶—In the *Brahmopanishad* also (24), Pippalāda appears, here with the title *bhagavān Aṅgirās*; he is thus identified with the latter, as the authority for the particular

¹⁷⁵ Roer's translation is published in vol. xv. of the *Bibl. Indica* (1853). as *pañchakhaṇḍā 'ṣṭamān* (read 'mī')

¹⁷⁶ Edited with Nārāyaṇa's commentary in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, 1872; in his introduction described as *Muṇḍat Paippalādābhīdhā tathā*.

doctrine here taught which he imparts to Śaunaka (*mahāśāla*), exactly as is the case in the Muṇḍakopaniṣad. There is, for the rest, a considerable difference between this Upaniṣad¹⁷⁷ and the Muṇḍaka and Praśna; it belongs more to the Yoga-Upaniṣads properly so called. It consists of two sections: the first, which is in prose, treats, in the first place, of the majesty of Ātman; and later on, in its last portion, it alleges Brahman, Viṣṇu, Rudra, and Akshara to be the four *pādas* (feet) of the *nirvāṇam brahma*; the first eleven of the nineteen verses of the second section discuss the subject of the Yogin being allowed to lay aside his *yajnopavīta*, or sacred thread, as he stands in the most intimate relation to the *sūtra*, or

Svetasvataropaniṣad, and again describe the majesty of the One.—The Māndūkyaopaniṣad (25–28) is reckoned as consisting of four Upaniṣads, but only the prose portion of the first of these, which treats of the three and a half *mātrās* of the word *om*, is to be looked upon as the real Māndūkyaopaniṣad, all the rest is the work of Gaudapāda,* whose pupil Govinda was the teacher of Śaṅkara; it dates therefore from about the seventh century A.D. Similarly, there are two works by Śaṅkara himself specified among the Upaniṣads, viz., the *Āptarajrasūcti* (29), in prose, and the *Triṇūrī* (30), likewise in prose; both composed in a Vedānta sense. The former treats at the outset of what makes a *Brāhmaṇa* a *Brāhmaṇa*; it is not *jāti* (birth), *varṇa* (colour), *pāṇḍitya* (learning); but the *Brahmavid* (he who knows Brahman) is alone a *Brāhmaṇa*.† Then it passes to the different definitions of *mokṣha* (liberation),

¹⁷⁷ Edited with Nārāyaṇ's comm. in *Bibl. Ind.* 1873; in the introduction described as *chatuskhanda* *daśamī*; the two sections of the text seem to have been transposed in some of the MSS.

* As such, it has been commented on by Śaṅkara under the title *dyama-hitra*. For particulars see *f. St.*, ii. 100–109. [Roer has published the

entire Māndūkyaopaniṣad together with Śaṅkara's comm. in *Bibl. Ind.* vol. viii., also a translation of sect. i in vol. xv.]

† This portion has been used by a Buddhist (*Aśvaghoṣa*), almost literally, against the system of caste in general, in the tract of the same title which is given by Gildemeister, *Bibl. S.*, Praef. p. vi. not.; see also

stating the only correct one to be the perception of the oneness of *jīva* (the individual soul) and *parameśvara* (the All-Soul), and lastly, distinctly rejecting all sects, it expounds the two highly important words *tat* (the Absolute) and *tvam* (the Objective). The *Tripurī* treats of the relation of *Ātman* to the world, and stands as fourth *prakaraṇa* in a series of seven little Vedānta writings attributed to Śaṅkara.¹⁷⁸ The *Sarvopanishatsāropanishad* (31), in prose, may be considered as a kind of catechism of these doctrines; its purpose is to answer several queries prefixed to it as an introduction.¹⁷⁹ The same is the case with the *Nīrālam-bopanishad* (32),¹⁸⁰ which, however, exhibits essentially the Yoga standpoint. The *Ātmopanishad* (33), in prose, contains an inquiry by Aṅgiras into the three factors (*puruṣas*), the body, the soul, and the All-Soul.* The *Prāṇāgnihotropanishad* (34), in prose, points out the relation of the parts and functions of the body to those of the sacrifice, whence by implication it follows that the latter is unnecessary. At its conclusion it promises to him who reads this *Upanishad* the same reward as he receives who expires in Vārānaśī, viz., deliverance from transmigration.¹⁸¹ The *Arshikopanishad* (? 35) contains a dialogue on the nature of *Ātman* between Viśvāmitra, Jamadagni, Bharadvāja, Gautama, and Vasishṭha, the last of whom, appealing to the opinion of "K'hak" (? another MS. in Anquetil has "Kapl" = Kapila ?), obtains the assent of the others.¹⁸²

Burnouf, *Introd. à l'Hist. du Buddh. Ind.*, p. 215. [Text and translation see now in my essay *Die Vajrasūchi des Aśvaghoṣa* (1860). By Haug, *Brahman und die Brahmanen*, p. 29, the *Upanishad* is described as *sāma-vedoktā*.]

¹⁷⁸ See my Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., p. 180. By Rājendra Lāla Mitra, however (*Notices of Sanskrit MSS.*, i. 10, 11), a different text is cited as the *śrīmachhamkarāchārya-vivachitā tripuryupanishad*.

¹⁷⁹ See *I. St.*, i. 301; edited with Nārāyaṇa's comm. in *Bibl. Ind.* 1874; described in the introd. as *Taittirīyake | sarvopanishadāṃ sārāḥ sapta-triṃśe chaturdaśe* (!?).

¹⁸⁰ See Rājendra Lāla Mitra, ii. 95. Taylor, *Catalogue of Oriental MSS. of the College Fort St. George*, ii. 462.

* Translated in *I. St.*, ii. 56, 57. [Text and Nārāyaṇa's comm. in *Bibl. Ind.* 1873; described in the introd. as *khaṇḍatrayānritā | aṣṭāviṃśi grantha-saṃghe śākhā Śaunakavartitā*.]

¹⁸¹ Text and Nārāyaṇa's comm. in *Bibl. Ind.* 1873; described in the introd. as *ekādaśi Śaunakiye*; see Taylor, ii. 472. Rājendra L. M. i. 49. Burnell, *Catalogue*, p. 63.

¹⁸² See *I. St.*, ix. 48-52. The name of the *Upanishad* is not yet certain.

regarded as supplements to the *Āraṇyaka* of the Black Yajus, as the *Jābālopāniṣad* is to that of the White Yajus. The *Bhāllavi-Upaniṣad* (41) also belongs to this class, to judge by quotations from it, and so does the *Samvartaśruti* (42); similarly the *Samnyāsopāniṣad* (43) and the *Paramahansopāniṣad* (44), both in prose.* The *Haṇsopāniṣad* (45) I have not yet met with; but from its name it probably also belongs to this place.¹⁸⁵ The *Āśramopāniṣad* (46), in prose, gives a classification of the four Indian orders—the Brahmachārins, Grihasthas, Vānaprasthas, and Parivrajakas. It is even quoted by Śaṅkara, and the names applied in it to the several classes are now obsolete. The *Śrīmaddattopāniṣad* (47) consists of twelve ślokas put into the mouth of one of these religious mendicants, and uniformly concluding with the refrain: *tasyā 'haṃ pañchamāśramam*, "I am his, i.e., brahman's, fifth Āśrama." Apart from the two Upaniṣads already mentioned, the *Māṇḍūkya* and the *Tāraka*, the investigation of the sacred word *om* is principally conducted in the *Atharvaśikhā* (48), in prose (explained by Śaṅkara), in which instruction is given on this subject by Atharvan to Pippalāda, Sanatkumāra, and Aṅgiras;† further, in the *Brahmaṇḍya* (49), in thirteen ślokas, now and then quoted by Śaṅkara;‡ and lastly, in the *Saunaka*

edited in *Bibl. Ind.* (1873), with Nārāyaṇa's commentary; although under the name *Kaṇṭha*, it is clear from Nārāyaṇa's words in his introduction, *Yajurvede tu Charakā dvādaśai 'śhā kaṇṭhāśrayaḥ (!) | samnyāsopāniṣattulyā chatuḥkhaṇḍā kṛitā (!) śrutiḥ ||* that this mode of spelling here, as well as in Burnell's *Catalogue*, p. 60, is a mere mistake, and that Nārāyaṇa himself connected the Upaniṣad with the *Kaṭhas*; see also Bühler, *Catalogue of MSS. from Guj.*, i. 58.]

* The *Paramahansopāniṣad* is translated in *I. St.*, ii., 173-176. [Text with Nār.'s comm. in *Bibl. Ind.*, 1874; described in the introd. as *trikhaṇḍa 'tharvaśikhare chatvāriṇ-sattamī*.—The *Samnyāsopāniṣad*, too, is printed *ibid.*, 1872; we there find a direct reference made to four

anuvākas of the *Ath. S.* (xviii.); their text is therefore given by the editor in the scholium, and that in a double form acc. to two MSS. (pp. 131-175); see also Rājendra L. M. i. 54, Taylor, ii. 469.]

¹⁸⁵ Text and Nār.'s comm. in *Bibl. Ind.*, 1874; described in the introd. as *aṣṭatrinśattamī | ātharvaṇe*. By Rājendralāl, i. 90, a comm. by Śaṅkarānanda is specified; see besides Burnell, p. 65.

† See *I. St.*, ii. 55.—Here, therefore, we have Pippalāda and Aṅgiras appearing side by side (see above, p. 160). [Text and Nār.'s comm. in *Bibl. Ind.*, 1873; described in the introd. as *sāptamī mundaṭ*.]

‡ Translated in *I. St.*, ii. 58. [Text and Nār.'s comm. in *Bibl. Ind.*, 1873.]

(50) and the *Praṇava* (51). These two are found in Anquetil only.¹⁸⁶ The various stages of gradual absorption into *Ātman* form the contents of the following Upanishads (52-59): *Haṁsanāda* (in prose), *Kṣhurikā* (24 ślokas), *Nādarindu* (20 ślokas), *Brahmarindu* (22 ślokas; 38 ślokas; kas), *Yoga-* while the

majesty of *Ātman* himself is depicted in the *Chūlikā* (60, in 21 ślokas) and *Tejovindu* (61, in 14 ślokas):* in the former direct reference is repeatedly made to the doctrine of the Atharvans. The range of ideas and the style are quite identical in all the Upanishads just enumerated. The latter frequently suffers from great obscurity, partly because there occur distinct grammatical inaccuracies, partly because the construction is often very broken and without unity. Many verses recur in several of them; many again are borrowed from the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* or *Maitrāyaṇopaniṣad*. Contempt for caste as well as for writing (*grantha*) is a trait which appears again and again in almost all these Upanishads, and one might therefore be inclined to regard them as directly Buddhistic, were they not entirely free from all Buddhistic dogma. This agreement is to be explained simply by the fact that Buddhism itself must be considered as having been originally only a form of the *Sāṃkhya*-doctrine.

The sectarian Upanishads have been set down as forming the third class. They substitute for *Ātman* one of the forms of *Vishnu* or *Śiva*, the earlier ones following the *Yoga*-doctrine most closely, whilst in those of a modern date the personal element of the respective deities comes

¹⁸⁶ See *I. St.*, ix. 52-53 and 49-52; the *Praṇatopaniṣad* is mentioned by Taylor, ii. 328.

* For the *Haṁsanāda* see *I. St.*, i. 385-387; the *Kṣhurikā* is trans-

lated by Jones's comm. (1872-73), excepting the *Haṁsanāddopaniṣad*, which, however, seems to be identical with the *Haṁspaniṣad* printed *ibid.* In the Introductions to the comm. *Chūlikā* is described as *pañchamī*; *Brahmarindu* as *aṣṭadāśī Śauna-*
lagranthavistare; *Dhyāvarindu* as

ix. 23-25; *Chūlikā*, ix. 10-21. All these Upanishads are now published in the *Bibliotheca Indica* with Nārā-

more and more into the foreground. A special characteristic of this class are the unmeasured promises usually held out at the close of the work to him who reads and studies it, as also the quotation and veneration of sacred formulas containing the name of the particular deity.

First, as regards the Upanishads of the *Vishṇu*-sects,—the oldest form under which Vishṇu is worshipped is *Nārāyaṇa*. We find this name for the first time in the second part of the Śatāpatha-Brahmaṇa, where, however, it is not in any way connected with Vishṇu; it rather stands, as at the commencement of Manu and the Vishṇu-Purāṇa, in the sense of Brahman (mascul.). This is also the case in the *Nārāyaṇīyopanishad* of the Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka, and in its Atharvan-recension as *Brihannārāyaṇopanishad*, although in the latter he is at least called Hari, and in one passage brought into direct relation to Vāsudeva and Vishṇu. It is in the *Mahā-Upanishad* (62),—a prose tract, which* in its first part contains the emanation of the universe from Nārāyaṇa, and in its second a paraphrase of the principal passage of the *Nārāyaṇīyopanishad*,—that Nārāyaṇa first distinctly appears as the representative of Vishṇu, since Śūlapāṇi (Śiva) and Brahman proceed from him, and Vishṇu is not mentioned at all. In the *Nārāyaṇopanishad* (64, in prose),¹⁸⁷ on the contrary, Vishṇu also emanates from him, exactly as in the *Nārāyaṇa* section† of the twelfth book of the *Mahā-Bhārata* (a book which in other respects also is of special significance in relation to the Sāṃkhya- and Yoga-doctrines). The sacred formula here taught is: *om namo Nārāyaṇāya*. There exists of this Upanishad another, probably a later, recension which forms part of the *Atharvaśiras* to be mentioned hereafter, and in which Devakīputra Madhusūdana is mentioned as particularly *brahmanya*, pious, as is also the case in the *Ātmaprabodha-Upanishad* (65), which like-

* Translated in *I. St.*, ii. 5-8 [see also Taylor, ii. 468, Rājendra L. M. i. 25]; besides it there must have existed another *Mahā-Upan.* (63), which is cited by the adherents of the Mādhava sect as a warrant for their belief in a personal soul of the universe, distinct from the soul of man.

¹⁸⁷ See also Rājendra L. M. i. 12, 91 (comm. by Saṃkarānanda).

† At the time of the (last?) arrangement of the present text of the *Mahā-Bhārata*, Nārāyaṇa worship must have been particularly flourishing.

wise celebrates Nārāyaṇa as the Supreme Lord; ¹⁸³ see *I. St.*, ii. 8, 9. He (Nārāyaṇa) is named, besides, in the same quality in the Garbhopanishad (in a passage recurring in the Nirukti, xiv.) and in the Śākalyopanishad.

The second form under which we find Vishnu worshipped is *Nṛsiṃha*. The earliest mention of him hitherto known appears in the Taitt. Ār., x. 1. 8 (in the Nārāyaṇīyop), under the name of Nārasimha, and with the epithets *rajanakha* and *tikṣṇadaṇṣhtra*. The only Upanishad in which he is worshipped is the *Nṛsiṃhatāpanīyopanishad* (in prose). It is relatively of considerable extent, and is also counted as six separate Upanishads (66-71), as it consists of two parts,* the first of which is in turn subdivided into five distinct Upanishads. The first part treats of the Anushtubh-formula † sacred to Nṛsiṃha, the *mantrarāja nārasiṃha ānushṭubha*, with which the most wondrous tricks are played; wherein we have to recognise the first beginnings of the later Māhāmantras with their Tantra-ceremonial. A great portion of the Māndūkyopanishad is incorporated into it, and the existence also of the Atharvaśikhā is presupposed, as it is directly quoted. The contents of the second part are of a more speculative character; but in respect of mystical trifling it does not yield to the first part. In both, the triad—Brahman, Vishnu, and Śiva—is repeatedly mentioned. As regards language, the expression *buddha* for the supreme Ātman, which occurs (along with *nitya*, *buddha*, *satya*, *mukta*, &c.) in the second part, is of peculiar interest; and the expression is still retained in Gaudapāda and Śaṅkara; originally it belongs evidently to the Śāṅkhya school (see above, pp. 27, 129).

This Upanishad has been interpreted by Gaudapāda and Śaṅkara; and in addition to much that is quite modern, it presents a great deal that is ancient. It probably dates from about the fourth century A.D., as at that

¹⁸³ See also Rājendra L. M., iii. 36; Taylor, ii. 328.

* The above-mentioned lists of Upanishads in the Chambers collection admit a *Madhyatāpīnī* also [see my Catalogue, p. 95].

† It runs *ugraṇ tīraṃ mahānṣh-*

time the Nṛsiṅha worship flourished on the western coast of India, while otherwise we find no traces of it.¹⁸⁹

The *Rāmatāpanīyopanishad* (72, 73), in which Rāma is worshipped as the Supreme God, shows a great resemblance to the Nṛsiṅhatāpanīyop., especially in its second part. This second part, which is in prose, is, properly speaking, nothing but a collection of pieces from the Tārakopanishad, Māndūkyopanishad, Jābālopanishad, and Nṛsiṅhopanishad, naturally with the necessary alterations. Yājñavalkya here appears as the proclaimer of the divine glory of Rāma. A London MS. adds at the close a long passage which is unknown to the commentator Ānandavānā (a native of the town Kuṇḍina). The crowning touch of the sectarian element in this Upanishad is found in the circumstance that Rāma is implored by Śiva (Śaṃkara) himself to spare those a second birth who die in Maṇikarnikā or in the Gaṅgā generally, the two principal seats of the Śiva worship. The first part, in ninety-five *ślokas*, contains at the beginning a short sketch of Rāma's life, which bears a great similarity to that at the beginning of the Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa, (in the Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa). The Mantrarāja is next taught by the help of a mystical alphabet, specially invented for the purpose.* This Upanishad evidently belongs to the school of Rāmānuja, possibly to Rāmānuja himself, consequently its earliest date would be the eleventh century A.D.¹⁹⁰

Under the names Viṣṇu, Puruṣhottama, and Vāsudeva, Viṣṇu is mentioned as the supreme Ātman in several

¹⁸⁹ See text and translation of this Upanishad in *I. St.*, ix. 53-173; and specially on the chronological question, pp. 62, 63. In the *Bibl. Indica* also, this Upanishad has been published by Rāmamaya Tarkaratna (1870-71), with Śaṃkara's commentary (it is, however, doubtful whether the commentary on the second part belongs to Śaṃkara), together with the small (*Nārasīṅha*) *śaṭchak-ropanishad* and Nārāyaṇa's comm. on it.

*. The Nārasīṅha- and a Vārāha-Mantra are also mentioned.

¹⁹⁰ See text and translation in my essay *Die Rāma-Tāpanīya-Upani-*

shad (1864); text and Nārāy.'s comm. in *Bibl. Ind.* also (1873); in the introductions the two sections are called *pañchatrinśattama* and *śaṭ-trinśa* respectively. The time of composition is probably even later than above supposed. In the first place, according to Nṛsiṅha's statements in his *Smṛtyarthasāra* (see Aufrecht, *Catalogus*, pp. 285^b, 286^a), Rāmānuja flourished as late as the twelfth century (*śaka* 1049 = A.D. 1127). But further, the *Rāmatāpanī* displays still closer relations to Rāmānanda, who is supposed to have lived towards the end of the fourteenth century; see my essay, p. 382.

Upanishad has been expounded by Śamkara. Under the same title, "head of Atharvan,"—a name that is also borne by Brahman himself, although in a different relation,—there exists a second Upanishad, itself a conglomeration of five different Upanishads referring to the five principal deities, Gaṇapati (79), Nārāyaṇa, Rudra, Sūrya (80), and Devī (81).^{*} Its Nārāyaṇa-portion is a later recension of the Nārāyaṇopaniṣad (64, see above, p. 166), and the Rudra-portion follows the first chapter of the Atharvaśiras proper. All five have been translated by Vans Kennedy. In the Mahā-Bhārata (i. 2882), and the Code of Viṣṇu, where the Atharvaśiras is mentioned along with the *Bhā-rundāni sāmāni*, and in Viṣṇu also, where it appears beside the Śatarudriya (as the principal means of expiation), the reference probably is to the Upanishad explained by Śamkara(?).—The *Rudrop.* and *Atharvanīya-Rudrop.* are known to me only through the Catalogue of the India Office Library. Possibly they are identical with those already named; I therefore exclude them from my list. The *Mṛityulāṅghanopaniṣad* (82)[†] is quite modern, and with it is wor-

the Kaivalyopaniṣad printed in *Bibl. Ind.*, 1874; the first commentary is that of Nārāyaṇa; the second is described by the editor as that of Śamkara, in the colophon as that of Śamkarānanda; it follows, however, from Rājendra Lāla Mitra's *Catalogue*, i. 32, that it is different from the commentary written by the latter; and according to the same authority, ii. 247, it is identical rather with that of Vidyāranya. In Nārāyaṇa's introduction this Upanishad is described (exactly like the Jābalop.!) as *ekachattvāriṣṭtamī*. The *Śiras-* or *Atharvaśiras-* Upanishad is likewise printed in *Bibl. Ind.* (1872), with Nārāyaṇa's comm., which describes it as *rudrādhyāyāḥ sapta-khaṇḍaḥ*. See also Rājendral., i. 32 (comm. by Śamkarānanda), 48.]

^{*} See *I. St.*, ii. 53, and Vans Kennedy, *Researches into the Nature and Affinity of Hindu and Ancient Mythology*, p. 442, &c. [Taylor, ii. 469-471. By Rājendral., i. 61, a Gāṇa-

patyapūrvatāpantiyopaniṣad is mentioned; by Bühler, *Cat. of MSS. from Guj.*, i. 70, a *Gaṇapatipūrvatāpintī* and a *Gaṇśatāpintī*; and by Kielhorn, *Sanskrit MSS. in the Southern Division of the Bombay Pres.* (1869), p. 14, a *Gaṇapatipūrvatāpantiyopaniṣad*.]

[†] So we have probably to understand Anquetil's *Amrat Lankoul*, since he has also another form, *Mrat Lankoun*; instead of, *id est 'halitus mortis'*, we ought to read '*salitus mortis*.' [See now *I. St.*, ix. 21-23; according to this it is doubtful whether the name ought not to be written *Mṛityulāṅgula* (?). An Upanishad named *Mṛityulāṅghana* is mentioned by Bühler, *Cat. of MSS. from Guj.*, i. 120; a *Mṛityulāṅgula*, however, appears as 82d Upanishad in the Catalogue of Paṇḍit Rādhākṛiṣṇa's library. Finally, Burnell, in publishing the text in the *Indian Antiquary*, ii. 266, gives the form *Mṛityulāṅgala*.]

thily associated the *Kūlāgnirudropanishad* (83),¹⁰³ in prose, of which there are no less than three different recensions, one of which belongs to the Nandikeśvara-Upapurāṇa. The *Tripuropanishad* (84) also appears from its name—otherwise it is unknown to me—to belong to this division;¹⁰⁴ it has been interpreted by Bhatta Bhāskara Miśra. The *Skandopanishad* (85), in fifteen ślokas, is also Śiva-itic¹⁰⁵ (likewise the *Amritāndopanishad*). The adoration of Śiva's spouse, his Śakti,—the origin of which may be traced back to the Kenopaniṣad and the Nārāyaṇīyopaniṣad,—is the subject of the *Sundarītāpaṇīyopaniṣad* (known to me by name only), in five parts (86–90), as well as of the *Devī-Upanishad* (79), which has already been mentioned. The *Kaulopaniṣad* (91), in prose, also belongs to a Śākta sectary.*

Lastly, a few Upanishads (92–95) have to be mentioned, which are known to me only by their names, names which do not enable us to draw any conclusion as to their contents, viz., the *Piṇḍopaniṣad*, *Nīlarūhupaniṣad* (Colebrooke has *Nīlarudra*), *Pañgalopaniṣad*, and *Darśanopaniṣad*.¹⁰⁶ The *Garuḍopaniṣad* (96), of which I know two totally different texts, celebrates the serpent-destroyer Garuḍa,† and is not without some antiquarian interest.

¹⁰³ It treats specially of the *tripuṇḍravīdhī*; see Taylor, i. 461; Rājendr., i. 59; Burnell, p. 61.

¹⁰⁴ See on it Taylor, ii. 470; Burnell, p. 62.

¹⁰⁵ "Identifies Śiva with Viṣṇu, and teaches the doctrines of the Advaita school." Taylor, ii. 467; Burnell, p. 65.

* In the *Tejovindu* (61) also, *brahman* is described as *dnaiḥ, śm-bhāḥ, śāṭṭa*.

¹⁰⁶ The *Piṇḍop.* and the *Nīlarudrop.*—this is its proper name—are now printed in *Bibl. Ind.* (1873), with Nārāyaṇi's comm.; the former, which treats of the *piṇḍas* to the *pretas*, is described by Nārāyaṇa as

saptavīṁśatipūrāṇī, the latter as *ślokaś*; it is addressed to Rudra (see also Rājendr., i. 51), and consists only of verses, which closely follow those contained in Vāj. S. xvi. On the *Pañgalop.* and *Darśanop.*, see Taylor, ii. 468–471.

† As is done in the *Nārāyaṇīyopaniṣad* also, and more especially

St. xiv. 1, 11 — The *Garuḍopaniṣad* is now printed in *Bibl. Ind.* (1874), with Nārāyaṇa's commentary; in the introduction it is described as *chaṭvīṣaṭvīṁśatī*]

SECOND PERIOD.

SANSKRIT LITERATURE.

*SECOND PERIOD.***SANSKRIT LITERATURE.**

HAVING thus followed the first period of Indian literature, in its several divisions, down to its close, we now turn to its second period, the so-called Sanskrit literature. Here, however, as our time is limited, we cannot enter so much into detail as we have hitherto done, and we must therefore content ourselves with a general survey. In the case of the Vedic literature, details were especially essential, both because no full account of it had yet been given, and because the various works still lie, for the most part, shut up in the manuscripts; whereas the Sanskrit literature has already been repeatedly handled, partially at least, and the principal works belonging to it are generally accessible.

Our first task, naturally, is to fix the distinction between the second period and the first. This is, in part, one of age, in part, one of subject-matter. The former distinction is marked by the language and by direct data; the latter by the nature of the subject-matter itself, as well as by the method of treating it.

As regards the language, in the first place, in so far as it grounds a distinction in point of age between the two periods of Indian literature, its special characteristics in the second period, although apparently slight, are yet, in reality, so significant that it appropriately furnishes the name for the period; whereas the earlier one receives its designation from the works composing it.

Among the various dialects of the different Indo-Aryan tribes, a greater unity had in the course of time been established after their immigration into India, as the natural result of their intermingling in their new homes, and of

their combination into larger communities. The grammatical * study, moreover, which by degrees became necessary for the interpretation of the ancient texts, and which grew up in connection therewith, had had the effect of substantially fixing the usage; so that a generally recognised language, known as the *bhāshā*, had arisen, that, namely, in which the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras are composed.† Now the greater the advance made by the study of grammar, the more stringent and precise its precepts and rules became, and all the more difficult it was for those who did not occupy themselves specially therewith to keep in constant accord with grammatical accuracy. The more the language of the grammatically educated gained on the one hand in purity, and in being purged of everything not strictly regular, the more foreign did it become on the other hand to the usage of the majority of the people, who were without grammatical training. In this way a refined language gradually disconnected itself from the vernacular, as more and more the exclusive property of the higher classes of the people;‡ the estrange-

* Respecting the use of the verb *vyākri* in a grammatical signification, Śāyana in his introduction to the Rik (p. 35. 22 ed. Muller) adduces a legend from a Brāhmaṇa, which represents Indra as the oldest grammarian. (See Lassen, *I. AK.*, ii. 475.) [The legend is taken from the TS. vi. 4. 7. 3. All that is there stated, indeed, is that *vāc* was *vyākṛitā* by Indra; manifestly, however, the later myths which do actually set up Indra as the oldest grammarian connect themselves with this passage.]

† *Bhāshika-srara* in Kātyāyana, Śrauta-Sūtra, i. S. 17, is expressly interpreted as *brāhmaṇa-srara*; see *Vāj. Samh. Specimen*, ii. 196. 197. [I. St., x. 428-429, 437.] Yaska repeatedly opposes *bhāshāyām* and *anvadhyaṇām* (i.e., 'in the Veda reading,' 'in the text of the hymns') to each other; similarly, the Prātiśākhya - Sūtras employ the words *bhāshā* and *bhāshya* as opposed to *chhandas* and *veda*, i.e., *saṃhitā* (see above, pp. 57, 103, 144). The way in

which the word *bhāshya* is used in the Grihya Sutra of Śāṅkhāyana, namely, in contradistinction to *Sūtra*, shows that its meaning had already by this time become essentially modified, and become restricted, precisely as it is in Pāṇini, to the extra-Vedic, so to say, profane literature. (The Āśvalāvāna-Grihya gives instead of *bhāshya*, in the corresponding passage, *bhārata-mahābhārata-dharma*.) [This is incorrect; rather, in the passage in question, these words follow the word *bhāshya*; see the note on this point at p. 56.] In the same way, in the Nir. xiii. 9, the *mantra*, *kalpa*, *brāhmaṇa*, and the *vyāvahārikī* (sc. *bhāshā*) are opposed to each other (and also *Rik*, *Yajus*, *Sāman*, and the *vyāvahārikī*).

‡ Ought the passage cited in Nir. xiii. 9 from a Brāhmaṇa [cf. Kāth. xiv. 5], to the effect that the Brāhmaṇas spoke both tongues, that the gods as well as that of men, be taken in this connection? or is this reference merely to a concept resembling the Homeric one?

ment between the two growing more and more marked, as the popular dialect in its turn underwent further development. This took place mainly under the influence of those aboriginal inhabitants who had been received into the Brahmanic community; who, it is true, little by little exchanged their own language for that of their conquerors, but not without importing into the latter a large number of new words and of phonetic changes, and, in particular, very materially modifying the pronunciation. This last was all the more necessary, as the numerous accumulations of consonants in the Aryan *bhāṣā* presented exceeding difficulties to the natives; and it was all the easier, as there had evidently prevailed within the language itself from an early period a tendency to clear away these troublesome encumbrances of speech,—a tendency to which, indeed, the study of grammar imposed a limit, so far as the educated portion of the Aryans was concerned, but which certainly maintained itself, and by the very nature of the case continued to spread amongst the people at large. This tendency was naturally furthered by the native inhabitants, particularly as they acquired the language not from those who were conversant with grammar, but from intercourse and association with the general body of the people. In this way
 ing directly
 from it mai

* And therefore specially so called down even to modern times; whereas the grammatically refined *bhāṣā* afterwards lost this title, and substituted for it the name *Saṃskṛita-bhāṣā*, 'the cultivated speech.' The name *Prākṛita-bhāṣā*, which was at the same time applied to the popular dialects, is derived from the word *prākṛiti*, 'nature,' 'origin,' and probably describes these as the

ceeding in common from.' The term directly opposed to it is not *sam-skrīta*, but *tailrīta*; see, e.g., Ath. Parīś. 49. 1, "*rarnān pūriam tyādhya-sydmah prākṛita ye cha tailrītah*." The earliest instances as yet known of the name *Saṃskṛit* as a designation of the language occur in the *Mṛichhakatī* (p. 44 2, ed. Stenzler), and in Varāha-Mihira's *Bṛhat-Suphiṭā*, §5. 3. The following passages

Saṃskṛita, but does not use it in this sense; though the *Pāṇinīyā-Sikṣhā* does so employ it (v. 3), in contradistinction to *prākṛita*.

then that of 'ordinary,' 'common,' 'vulgaris,' and lastly, that of 'pro-

the curtailment or loss of terminations. Not unfrequently, however, they present older forms of these than are found in the written language, partly because the latter has rigorously eliminated all forms in any way irregular or obsolete, but partly also, no doubt, from the circumstance that grammar was cultivated principally in the north or north-west of India, and consequently adapted itself specially to the usage there prevailing. And in some respects (e.g., in the instr. plur. of words in *a*?)¹⁹⁷ this usage may have attained a more developed phase than appears to have been the case in India Proper,* since the language was not there hampered in its independent growth by any external influence; whereas the Aryans who had passed into India maintained their speech upon the same internal level on which it stood at the time of the immigration,† how-

¹⁹⁷ This example is not quite pertinent, as the instr. plur. in *-āis* is of very ancient date, being reflected not only in Zend, but also in Slavic and Lithuanian; see Bopp, *Vergl. Gram.*, i. 156³ (159³).

* The difference in usage between the Eastern and Western forms of speech is once touched upon in the *Brāhmaṇa* of the White Yajus, where it is said that the *Vāhikas* style *Agni Bhava*, while the *Prāchīnas*, on the contrary, call him *Śarva*. *Yāska* (ii. 2) opposes the *Kambojas* (the *Persa-Aryans*?) to the *Aryas* (the *Indo-Aryans*?), stating that the latter, for instance, possess derivatives only of the root *śu*, whereas the *Kambojas* possess it also as a verb. (Grammarians of the *Kambojas* are hardly to be thought of here, as Roth, *Zur Lit.*, p. 67, supposes.) *Yāska* further opposes the *Prāchīnas* and the *Udīchyas*, and the same is done by *Pāṇini*. According to the *Brāhmaṇa*, the *Udīchyas* were most conversant with grammar [see *I. St.*, i. 153, ii. 309, 310, xiii. 363, ff. Burnell's identification of the *Kambojas* here, and in the other earlier passages where they are mentioned, with Cambodia in Farther India, see his *Elements of South Indian Palaeography*, pp. 31, 32, 94, is clearly a mistake. For the time of the *Pāli*

Abhidhānappadīpikā (v. Childers, *Pāli Dict.*) this identification may perhaps be correct; but the older *Pāli* texts, and even the inscriptions of *Piyadasi* (e.g., most distinctly the facsimile of the *Khālsi* inscription in Cunningham's *Archæological Survey*, i. 247, pl. xli., line 7), introduce the *Kambojas* in connection with the *Yavanas*; and this of itself determines that the two belonged geographically to the same region in the north-west of India; see *I. Str.*, ii. 321. In addition to this we have the name *Kabujiya* = *Καβύσιος*, and therewith all the various references to this latter name, which point to a very wide ramification of it throughout *Irān*; see *I. Str.*, ii. 493. To Farther India the name *Kamboja* evidently found its way only in later times, like the names *Ayodhyā*, *Indraprastha*, *Irāvātī*, *Champā*; though it certainly remains strange that this lot should have fallen precisely to it. Perhaps causes connected with Buddhism may have helped to bring this about. See on this point the *Jenaer Literaturzeitung*, 1877, p. 418; *Indian Antiquary*, iv. 244.

† Much as the Germans did, &c. in the middle ages emigrated to Transylvania.

ever considerable were the external modifications which it underwent.

The second period of Indian literature, then, commences with the epoch when the separation of the language of the educated classes—of the written language—from the popular dialects was an accomplished fact. It is in the former alone that the literature is presented to us. Not till after the lapse of time did the vernaculars also in their turn produce literatures of their own,—in the first instance under the influence of the Buddhist religion, which addressed itself to the people as such, and whose scriptures and records, therefore, were originally, as for the most part they still are, composed in the popular idiom. The epoch in question cannot at present be precisely determined; yet we may with reasonable certainty infer the existence of the written language also, at a time when we are in a position to point to the existence of popular dialects; and with respect to these we possess historical evidence of a rare order, in those rock-inscriptions, of identical purport, which have been discovered at Girnar in the Gujarát peninsula, at Dhauli in Orissa, and at Kapur di Giri¹⁰⁸ in Kabul.

Lassen, re

who reig

recent investigations on the subject—by Wilson, in the "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," xii, 1850 (p. 95 of the separate impression)—they were engraved "at some period subsequent to B.C. 205,"* and are are still, therefore, of uncertain date. However this question may be settled, it in any case results with tolerable certainty

¹⁹³ This name ought probably to be written *Kapardigiri*. See my paper on the *Satrumjaya Mahātmya*, p. 118. In these inscriptions, moreover, we have a text, similar in purport, repeated to twice in these districts.

denkstukken van Atsala den Buddhist
(1873, particularly p. 32 ff., 45 ff.).

* And that not much later; as is vouched for by the names of the Greek kings therein mentioned—Alexander, Antigonus, Magas, Ptolemy, Antiochus. These cannot, it is true, be regarded as contemporaneous with the inscriptions; but their notoriety in India can hardly have been of such long duration that the inscriptions can have been composed long after their time. See Wilson, *l. c.*

the curtailment or loss of terminations. Not unfrequently, however, they present older forms of these than are found in the written language, partly because the latter has rigorously eliminated all forms in any way irregular or obsolete, but partly also, no doubt, from the circumstance that grammar was cultivated principally in the north or north-west of India, and consequently adapted itself specially to the usage there prevailing. And in some respects (e.g., in the instr. plur. of words in *a*?)¹⁵⁷ this usage may have attained a more developed phase than appears to have been the case in India Proper,* since the language was not there hampered in its independent growth by any external influence; whereas the Aryans who had passed into India maintained their speech upon the same internal level on which it stood at the time of the immigration,† how-

¹⁵⁷ This example is not quite pertinent, as the instr. plur. in *-āis* is of very ancient date, being reflected not only in Zend, but also in Slavonic and Lithuanian; see Bopp, *Vergl. Gram.*, i. 156² (159³).

* The difference in usage between the Eastern and Western forms of speech is once touched upon in the Brāhmana of the White Yajus, where it is said that the Vāhikas style Agni *Bhava*, while the Prāchyas, on the contrary, call him *Sarva*. Yāska (ii. 2) opposes the Kambojas (the Persa-Aryans?) to the Āryas (the Indo-Aryans?), stating that the latter, for instance, possess derivatives only of the root *śu*, whereas the Kambojas possess it also as a verb. (Grammarians of the Kambojas are hardly to be thought of here, as Roth, *Zur Lit.*, p. 67, supposes.) Yāska further opposes the Prāchyas and the Udīchyas, and the same is done by Pāṇini. According to the Brāhmana, the Udīchyas were most conversant with grammar [see *I. St.*, i. 153, ii. 309, 310, xiii. 363, ff. Burnell's identification of the Kambojas here, and in the other earlier passages where they are mentioned, with Cambodia in Farther India, see his *Elements of South Indian Palæography*, pp. 31, 32, 94, is clearly a mistake. For the time of the Pāli

Abhidhānappadīpikā (v. Childers, *Pāli Dict.*) this identification may perhaps be correct; but the older Pāli texts, and even the inscriptions of Piyadasi (e.g., most distinctly the facsimile of the Khālsī inscription in Cunningham's *Archæological Survey*, i. 247, pl. xli., line 7), introduce the Kambojas in connection with the Yavanas; and this of itself determines that the two belonged geographically to the same region in the north-west of India; see *I. Str.*, ii. 321. In addition to this we have the name Kabujiya = *Kαυβύσις*, and therewith all the various references to this latter name, which point to a very wide ramification of it throughout Irān; see *I. Str.*, ii. 493. To Farther India the name Kamboja evidently found its way only in later times, like the names Ayodhyā, Indraprastha, Irāvātī, Champā; though it certainly remains strange that this lot should have fallen precisely to it. Perhaps causes connected with Buddhism may have helped to bring this about. See on this point the *Jenaer Literaturzeitung*, 1875, p. 418; *Indian Antiquary*, iv. 244.]

† Much as the Germans did, who in the middle ages emigrated to Transylvania.

ever considerable were the external modifications which it underwent.

The second period of Indian literature, then, commences with the epoch when the separation of the language of the educated classes—of the written language—from the popular dialects was an accomplished fact. It is in the former alone that the literature is presented to us. Not till after the lapse of time did the vernaculars also in their turn produce literatures of their own,—in the first instance under the influence of the Buddhist religion, which addressed itself to the people as such, and whose scriptures and records, therefore, were originally, as for the most part they still are, composed in the popular idiom. The epoch in question cannot at present be precisely determined; yet we may with reasonable certainty infer the existence of the written language also, at a time when we are in a position to point to the existence of popular dialects; and with respect to these we possess historical evidence of a rare order, in those rock-inscriptions, of identical purport, which have been discovered at Girnar in the Gujarât peninsula, at Dhauli in Orissa, and at Kapur di Giri¹⁰³ in

recent investigations on the subject—by Wilson, in the “Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,” xii, 1850 (p. 95 of the separate impression)—they were engraved “at some period subsequent to B.C. 205,”* and are are still, therefore, of uncertain date. However this question may be settled, it in any case results with tolerable certainty

¹⁰³ This name ought probably to

* And that not much later; as is vouched for by the names of the Greek kings therein mentioned—Alexander, Antigonus, Magas, Ptolemy, Antiochus. These cannot, it is true, be regarded as contemporaneous with the inscriptions; but their notoriety in India can hardly have been of such long duration that the inscriptions can have been composed long after their time. See Wilson, *l. c.*

bonne Loi, p. 652, ff. (1852); *I. St.*, iii. 467, ff. (1855); and Kern, *De Genesistulken van Atola den Buddhist* (1873, particularly) p. 32 ff., 45 ff.)

growth of the second period, the difficulty of connecting them with the earlier age is very great. We have here a distinct gap which it is altogether impossible to fill up. The reason of this lies simply in the fact, that owing to the difficulty of preserving literary works, the fortunate successor almost always wholly supplanted the predecessor it surpassed: the latter thus became superfluous, and was consequently put aside, no longer committed to memory, no longer copied. In all these branches therefore—unless some other influence has supervened—we are in possession only of those master-works in which each attained its culminating point, and which in later times served as the classical models upon which the modern literature was formed, itself more or less destitute of native productive energy. This fact has been already adduced as having proved equally fatal in the case of the more ancient Bráhma literature, &c.; there, much to the same extent as here, it exercised its lamentable, though natural influence. In the Vedic literature also, that is to say, in its Śákhás, we find the best analogy for another kindred point, namely, that some of the principal works of this period are extant in several—generally two—recensions. But along with this a further circumstance has to be noted, which, in consequence of the great care expended upon the sacred literature, has comparatively slight application to it, namely, that the mutual relation of the manuscripts is of itself such as to render any certain restoration of an original text for the most part hopeless. It is only in cases where ancient commentaries exist that the text is in some degree certain, for the time at least to which these commentaries belong. This is evidently owing to the fact that these works were originally preserved by oral tradition; their consignment to writing only took place later, and possibly in different localities at the same time, so that discrepancies of all sorts were inevitable. But besides these variations there are many alterations and additions which are obviously of a wholly arbitrary nature, partly made intentionally, and partly due to the mistakes of transcribers. In reference to this latter point, in particular, the fact must not be lost sight of that, in consequence of the destructive influence of the climate, copies had to be renewed very frequently. As a rule, the more ancient Indian manuscripts

language of which, however, is a very peculiar one, and is, moreover, restricted to a definite field. In fact, as the result of this neglect, prose-writing was completely arrested in the course of its development, and declined altogether. Anything more clumsy than the prose of the later Indian romances, and of the Indian commentaries, can hardly be; and the same may be said of the prose of the inscriptions.

This point must not be left out of view, when we now proceed to speak of a classification of the Sanskrit literature into works of Poetry, works of Science and Art, and works relating to Law, Custom, and Worship. All alike appear in a poetic form, and by 'Poetry' accordingly in this classification we understand merely what is usually styled *belles-lettres*, though certainly with an important modification of this sense. For while, upon the one hand, the poetic form has been extended to all branches of the literature, upon the other, as a set-off to this, a good deal of practical prose has entered into the poetry itself, imparting to it the character of poetry 'with a purpose.' Of the epic poetry this is especially true.

It has long been customary to place the Epic Poetry at the head of Sanskrit literature; and to this custom we here conform, although its existing monuments cannot justly pretend to pass as more ancient than, for example, Pāṇini's grammar, or the law-book which bears the name of Manu. We have to divide the epic poetry into two distinct groups: the *Itihāsa-Purāṇas* and the *Kāvyas*. We have already more than once met with the name *Itihāsa-Purāṇa* in the preceding chapters.

of the
and in
concern

apply to the legendary passages in the Brāhmanas themselves, and not to separate works; and also that, from a passage in the thirteenth book of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, it results with tolerable certainty that distinct works of this description cannot then have existed, inasmuch as the division into *parrans*, which is usual in the extant writings of this class, is there expressly attributed to other works, and is not employed in reference to these *Itihāsa-Purāṇas* themselves. On the other hand, in the *Sarpa-vidyā* ('serpent-knowledge') and the *Devajana-vidyā* ('

the gods')—to which, in the passage in question, the distribution into *parvans*, that is to say, existence in a distinct form, is expressly assigned—we have in all probability to recognise mythological accounts, which from their nature might very well be regarded as precursors of the epic. We have likewise already specified as forerunners of the epic poetry, those myths and legends which are found interspersed throughout the *Bráhmaṇas*, here and there, too, in rhythmic form,* or which lived on elsewhere in the tradition regarding the origin of the songs of the *Rik*. Indeed, a few short prose legends of this sort have been actually preserved here and there in the epic itself. The *Gáthás* also—stanzas in the *Bráhmaṇas*, extolling individual deeds of prowess—have already been cited in the like connection: they were sung to the accompaniment of the lute, and were composed in honour either of the prince of the day or of the pious kings of old (see *I. St.*, i. 187). As regards the extant epic—the *Mahá-Bhárata*—specially, we have already pointed out the mention in the *Taittiríya-Áranyaka*, of Vyása Páráśarya¹⁹⁹ and Vaiśampáyana,²⁰⁰ who are given in the poem itself as its original authors; and we have also remarked (p. 143) that the family of the

* As, for instance, the story of Hariśchandra in the second part of the *Aitareya-Bráhmaṇa*.

¹⁹⁹ Vyása Páráśarya is likewise mentioned in the *vaṇśa* of the *Sáma-vidhána-Bráhmaṇa*, as the disciple of Vishvakṣena, and preceptor of Jaimini; see *I. St.*, iv. 377.—The *Mahábháshya*, again, not only contains frequent allusions to the legend of the *Mahá-Bhárata*, and even metrical quotations that connect themselves with it, but it also contains the name of Śuka Vaiyáśaki; and from this it is clear that there was then already extant a poetical version of the *Mahá-Bhárata* story; see *I. St.*, xiii. 357. Among the prior births of Buddha is one (No. 436 in Westergaard's *Catalogus*, p. 40), bearing the name Kaṇha-Dípáyana, i.e., Krishna-Dvaipáyana!

²⁰⁰ Vaiśampáyana appears elsewhere frequently, but always in spe-

cial relation to the transmission of the *Yajur-Veda*. By Páṇini, it is true (iv. 3. 104), he is simply cited generally as a Vedic teacher, but the *Mahábháshya*, commenting on this passage, describes him as the teacher of Káṭha and Kalápin. In the *Calcutta Scholium*, again, we find further particulars (from what source? cf. Táránátha on *Siddh. Kaum.*, i. 590), according to which (see *I. St.*, xiii. 440) nine Vedic schools, and among them two belonging to the *Sáma-Veda*, trace their origin to him. In the *Rig-Grihya* he is evidently regarded (see above, pp. 57, 58), after the manner of the *Vishṇu-Purána*, as the special representative of the *Yajur-Veda*; and so he appears in the *Anukr.* of the *Atreya* school, at the head of its list of teachers, specially as the preceptor of Yáska Paṇḍi.

Páñdava is represented with especial frequency in the recitals of the *Vishva-Yajus**. We also find repeated allusions in the *Brahmanas* of a Yajurvedic sacrifice and, on the authority of the *Mahá-Bhárata* itself, it was at such a sacrifice that the sacred recitation of the *Agni Sukta* place in presence of a *Samāja*. Even as has already been mentioned above [pp. 34, 45] these two sacrifices must be kept distinct, and indeed there is no mention in the *Brahmanas* of a *Samāja* as participating in the former. Yet several such sacrifices may have taken place in the *Vishva-Yajus* (see pp. 34, 45) or it is possible even that the statement as to the recitation in question may have no more foundation than the desire to give a peculiar consecration to the work. For it is utterly absurd to suppose that *Vyāsa Pīṇḍarya* and *Vaiśampāyana*—teachers mentioned for the first time in the *Taittiriya-Āraṇyaka*—could have been anterior to the sacrifice referred to in the *Brahmanas*. The mention of the “*Bhārata*” and of the “*Mahá-Bhārata*” itself in the *Grihya-Sūtras* of *Āśvalāyana* [and *Śāṅkhāyana*] we have characterised [p. 58] as an interpolation or else an indication that these *Sūtras* are of very late date. In *Pāṇini* the word “*Mahá-Bhārata*” does indeed occur; not, however, as denoting the epic of this name, but as an appellation to designate any individual of special distinction among the *Bhāratas*, like *Mahá-Jābāla*, *Hailihila* (see *I. St.*, ii. 73). Still, we do find names mentioned in *Pāñdava*

so that the legend must in any case have been current in his day, possibly even in a poetical shape; however surprising it may be that the name *Pāñdu*† is never mentioned by him. The earliest direct

* This renders Lassen's reference (*I. AK.*, i. 629) of the name *Pāñdarya* to the astronomer or chronologer *Parāśara*, highly questionable.

† A worshipper of *Vāsudeva*, or of *Arjuna*, is styled “*Vāsudevaka*,” “*Arjunaka*.” Or is *Arjuna* here still a name of *Indra*? [From the context he is to be understood as a *Kshatriya*; see on this, *I. St.*, xiii. 349, ff.; *Ind. Antiq.* iv. 246.]

‡ This name only occurs in the

Mahá-Bhārata and in the works resting upon it. Yet the Buddhists mention a mountain tribe of *Pāñdavas*, as alike the foes of the *Sākya*s (i.e., the *Kóśala*s) and of the inhabitants of *Ujjayini*; see Schiefner, *Leben des Sākyamuni*, pp. 4, 40 (in the latter passage they appear to be connected with *Takshāśilā*), and, further, Lassen, *I. AK.*, ii. 100, ff.; Foucaux, *Rgya Cher Rol Pa*, pp. 228, 229 (25, 26).